



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 110<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 153

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 2007

No. 24

## House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CAPUANO).

### DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,

February 8, 2007.

I hereby appoint the Honorable MICHAEL E. CAPUANO to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

### PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer: You, O Lord, are our light and our salvation. Lord God, may living faith lead to greater charity and strengthen our service. Fill us with wisdom that all may know the fullness of life is not found in self-interest, but in love and commitment to others.

Whether members of a family, CEOs in business, or elected officials in government, You ask all to show their faithfulness to love and their promotion of justice in ordinary decisions each day.

Those who say they love God and do not know how to be loving to others or forgive others or how to seek justice in practical ways for the voiceless and the powerless are living in blinding darkness. You, O Lord, are light for conscience, for the heart and for the world both now and forever.

Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. HENSARLING led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to ten 1-minute speeches on each side.

### HUD FY08 BUDGET REQUEST

(Mr. SIREs asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SIREs. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share my thoughts on the Department of Housing and Urban Development fiscal year 2008 budget. In my opinion, it is disgraceful. This budget cuts vital housing assistance programs, leaving low-income families, elderly and the disabled out in the cold.

The President's request cuts the Community Development Block Grant by 20 percent, cuts public housing programs by 7 percent, cuts disabled housing programs by 47 percent, and cuts elderly housing programs by 22 percent. The budget eliminated entirely the HOPE VI housing program, among others.

At the same time, the President also cuts the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program by 56 percent. So with both cuts to housing and the heating assistance programs, the President will leave the most vulnerable out in

the cold. I hope that this Congress will act with more thought by appropriating more funding for these vital programs.

### CONGRESSIONAL INACTION JEOPARDIZES BAKER COUNTY ROADS AND VOLUNTEER FIREFIGHTERS

(Mr. WALDEN of Oregon asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, failure of Congress to reauthorize the Secure Schools and Community Self-Determination Act amounts to a breach of faith to more than 600 forested counties and 4,400 school districts across America. To Baker County, Oregon, this breach of faith means the road department crew who plow snow 5 months out of the year will be cut in half. The county will also have to fire the only trainer who prepares volunteer firefighters in 13 rural communities.

If this Congress fails to act, the 11 people left in the road department will be responsible for maintaining 1,100 miles of road; that is one person for every 100 miles of road, the same distance from here to Richmond, Virginia.

If this Congress fails to act, volunteer firefighters might not receive the vital life-saving training on equipment, tactics and communications. County Judge Fred Warner says, Because we have vast Federal lands, we have no tax base to replace the lost funding. We just need the Federal Government to honor its commitment.

My colleagues, Congress must renew the Federal Government's promise to timbered communities. Pass H.R. 17. Time is running out.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H1347

# ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would respectfully remind Members not to traffic the well while another is under recognition.

## PRESIDENT'S BUDGET IS FISCALLY IRRESPONSIBLE

(Mr. ALTMIRE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ALTMIRE. Mr. Speaker, the 2002 budget the President submitted this week is more of the same, the same fiscal irresponsibility and misplaced priorities that we have come to expect from this administration's budgets over the past 6 years. This budget fails to put our fiscal house in order and instead adds \$3 trillion to the national debt over the next 10 years.

And while the President claims his budget achieves balance, he simply leaves out significant long-term costs. Well, American families can't leave out simple bills within their household budgets, and neither should the President be able to do so within his budget.

Mr. Speaker, Democrats will move us towards a balanced budget through fiscal responsibility and accountability, not accounting gimmicks.

## CRIME OF THE WEEK

(Mr. POE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, the crime of the week this week was not committed by some menacing outlaw, but it was committed by a repeat offender, the Texas Board of Pardons and Paroles.

The Texas parole board has been releasing violent offenders years before they are finished serving out their sentences, and then these violent criminals continue their lawless ways.

Keith Hines was supposed to be in the jailhouse for 30 more years for violent crimes against the citizens of the State, but the good old parole board gave him a get-out-of-jail-free card, and this was a fatal error.

On December 5, Hines robbed a gas station at gunpoint in Humble, Texas. The robber then ran to his vehicle to make his getaway. Witness, volunteer firefighter and good Samaritan, Steve Jackson, jumped into his car and followed Hines while relaying to 911 the locations of the hijacker.

Down the road, with Jackson in pursuit, Hines jumped out of his getaway car, ran up to Jackson's vehicle, shot Jackson twice and murdered him on the side of the road.

Hines is now charged with capital murder. All this because the Texas Board of Pardons and Paroles let this habitual offender go every which way, including loose.

And that's just the way it is.

## KUCINICH'S 12-POINT PLAN

(Mr. KUCINICH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KUCINICH. The House will soon entertain a resolution relating to the surge. It is a nonbinding resolution. The war, however, is binding.

The supplemental resolution relating to funding will give Congress an opportunity to take some binding action related to the war. Congress' real power is to cut off funds.

Money is there right now to bring the troops home, and money to bring the troops home is part of a plan that involves bringing in international peacekeepers while our troops leave.

I have a 12-point plan which I have circulated among Members of Congress as to how we can get out of Iraq. The American people will not tolerate non-binding resolutions as being an excuse for strong and substantive action to end the war as quickly as possible.

## CIANA VS. COCKFIGHTING

(Mr. PITTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Judiciary Committee considered a bill to protect chickens, roosters, from being carried across State lines for use in illegal cockfighting. An amendment was offered on a similar "cross State line" issue, protecting minor girls from being carried across State lines for the purpose of having an abortion without their parents' knowledge or consent.

While the committee ultimately passed the animal protections, they wouldn't even allow a vote on protecting young girls. Even more outrageous, the substance of the rejected amendment has passed twice in the House last year, with large bipartisan majorities.

Mr. Speaker, in case anyone is having trouble following this, let's summarize: by rejecting this amendment, Democrats saw fit to provide greater protections to birds than to minor girls and their parents and unborn children. It is as simple as that. This is supposed to be the year of the children? Not all of the children.

Welcome to the Pelosi Congress.

## BUSH TROOP ESCALATION BE- COMES A WORSE IDEA BY THE DAY—CONGRESS MUST SPEAK ITS VOICE

(Mr. TOWNS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, it is becoming clear day by day that the President's troop escalation plan is not in the best interest of this Nation.

First, the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office said the President's troop escalation plan would take substantially more troops and more money than the President has suggested.

The President says 21,500 troops are needed; the CBO says 48,000 troops are necessary to conduct the mission. The President says it will cost about \$5.6 billion, but CBO says that the number could be four times higher than that.

Second, the administration's intelligence agencies concluded last week that violence would continue in Iraq for at least another 18 months, but the President says his plan will calm the violence in 6 months.

And, third, Pentagon officials admitted last week that they do not have enough armored vehicles, armored kits and other equipment needed to protect these additional troops.

Mr. Speaker, after hearing these three different facts, how can anyone believe the President's troop escalation plan is in the best interests of this country?

On that note, I yield back.

## TED FELDER

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, last month the low country director of the office of South Carolina's Second Congressional District departed. Ted Felder, who has served the Second District since my election in 2001, has been named Economic Development Director for the City of Hardeeville, which will be one of the fastest growing cities in America in the next decade.

As a native of St. Matthews, Ted graduated from the University of South Carolina. He and his wife, Beth, have a 9-month-old son, John Goodwin. As a longtime friend of Ted's parents, John and Jane Felder, I have known Ted since he was a small child. I have also had the honor of serving with John in the general assembly.

I appreciate Ted's dedication to the low country and the needs of its constituents. I know he will bring the same commitment to the residents of Hardeeville. He has trained his successor, Allen Aimar, to be accessible and accountable, with office manager Deanna Connors.

In conclusion, God bless our troops. We will never forget September 11. Our prayers are with Congressman CHARLIE NORWOOD, his wife, Gloria, and his family.

## DUBUQUE, IOWA

(Mr. BRALEY of Iowa asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the City of Dubuque, Iowa, the oldest city in Iowa, located among the bluffs of the Upper Mississippi River for being named one of the 100 Best Communities for Young People by America's Promise.

I would also like to recognize the 11 residents of the City of Dubuque sitting in the gallery above who made the

long journey from Iowa to Washington to speak with Iowa's congressional delegation about keeping their promises to Dubuque's families. These residents' dedication and commitment illustrates why their community has been recognized with this honor.

In the annual 100 Best Communities for Young People competition, America's Promise honors outstanding efforts on behalf of young people by their communities. The people of Dubuque, Iowa, have demonstrated their commitment to families and children through their involvement of the Dubuque Mentoring Partnership. Thanks to the important work of the DMP, the number of mentors in Dubuque has more than tripled and the number of children waiting for a mentor has been cut in half since 2005.

As a longtime mentor with Big Brothers/Big Sisters in my hometown of Waterloo, I learned the importance of mentoring to give children the greatest opportunity to achieve their potential.

The people of Dubuque should be proud of their accomplishment. I am proud to represent them in Congress.

#### LET'S SAVE MONEY, NOT WASTE IT

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I rise in disbelief concerning the recent discussion about an airplane for the Speaker. Time and again Members of this body, and more importantly the American people, have been promised that this would be the most ethical and fiscally responsible Congress ever. Many things have clearly derailed that pledge, including a continuing resolution spending billions of dollars without any scrutiny.

What we are seeing here is a mentality of waste. I take the Speaker's word that she did not request the luxurious plane to transport her. However, it is troubling to me that the mentality of others is such that they would recommend more than what is needed.

We are the people's House, and the people expect us to spend their money wisely. We are here to serve, not live like kings and queens. This is an opportunity for us to review procedures and seek ways to save money, not waste it.

□ 1015

#### BUSH BUDGET SHORTCHANGES HOMELAND SECURITY PROGRAMS—PARTICULARLY FIRST RESPONDERS

(Mr. WILSON of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, President Bush sent Congress a budget for 2008 for the fiscal year that continues the misguided priorities of this administration. Last November,

the American people rejected the status quo, saying that we can do better. It is time for a change, it is a time for a change in direction.

Unfortunately, the President's budget is more of the same. His budget for the Department of Homeland Security is only 1 percent more than it was in 2007. This is a modest increase for a department that is charged with such a critical mission and has yet to meet the goals of protecting our country.

Particularly disappointing is the President's request for programs to support first responders. The President has reduced the preparedness and training by 33 percent. The firefighters' grants would be reduced by 55 percent. State and local law enforcement grants would also undergo cuts, depriving our communities of critical support when they need it most after 9/11.

Mr. Speaker, House Democrats are serious about ensuring that our local police departments and our firefighters have the equipment they need to better protect our communities. The President's budget must be rejected.

#### RETURN TO FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY

(Mr. HENSARLING asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, recently Speaker NANCY PELOSI said it is time for Congress to return to fiscal responsibility. It is often said that the best way to lead is by example. But I don't know if spending \$300,000 of the taxpayer money to fly the Speaker in a personal luxury jet to travel back and forth to San Francisco sets much of an example, particularly when any American can find a \$300 ticket for the same route on expedia.com.

According to CNN, Speaker PELOSI has requested that the military give her a jet that would include 42 business class seats, a fully enclosed stateroom, an entertainment center, a private bed, state-of-the-art communications system and a crew of 16.

Now, I know there are legitimate security concerns, but somehow the previous Speaker managed to use a smaller jet that seated 12 and had none of these amenities.

Why did the Speaker request this jet? According to the Washington Times, the Democrat, quote, "is seeking regular military flights not only for herself and her staff, but also for relatives and other Members of Congress."

If this is the Democrats' idea of fiscal responsibility, working families had better hold on to their wallets.

#### STOP TROOP ESCALATION

(Mr. WELCH of Vermont asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, it is becoming ever more clear that the troop escalation plan proposed by

the administration is not—is not—in our Nation's best interest or in the best interest of bringing stability to Iraq.

Last week, three different events demonstrated why it is absolutely essential that Congress accept its responsibility to debate the President's plan. First, the cost of the escalation: The President has advertised it to be \$5.6 billion; CBO, nonpartisan, estimates it will be \$21 billion.

Second, the number of troops required, the President is selling it, advertising it as requiring 21,600 troops. CBO estimates suggest that it will be at least 48,000 troops.

Next, Pentagon officials admitted last week that they do not have enough armored vehicles, armored kits and other equipment that is absolutely essential to protecting the well-being of our troops. We cannot be sending troops into battle without the equipment and the protection that they need.

#### CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF ARMY SERGEANT JOHN COOPER OF FLEMINGSBURG, KENTUCKY

(Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the legacy of a brave young man from my district who recently lost his life fighting in Iraq. A resident of Ewing, Kentucky, Sergeant John Cooper lost his life in a roadside bomb attack just outside of Mosul. Sergeant Cooper was serving in Iraq with the Army's 2nd Squadron, 7th Cavalry, and was working on security operations in the area.

I recently had the opportunity to meet with John Cooper's mother, friends and family. They relayed to me stories of a brave young man who answered the call to duty by joining the Army in 1995 after graduating from Fleming County High School. He served in Iraq from February of 2003 to February of 2004 before being stationed in Korea.

In October 2006, he returned on a second tour. His mother, Janice Botkin, told me that her son was living out his life-long dream of serving in the military. She spoke to me of her son's bravery, his dedication and absolute belief in his mission, and by all accounts, Sergeant Cooper was a well-respected member and leader of his unit and his community.

Today, as we celebrate the life and memory of this great soldier, my thoughts and prayers are with Sergeant John Cooper's family and friends. The entire Nation is deeply indebted to Sergeant Cooper. We thank him for his service, and we honor him for his ultimate sacrifice.

#### ENCOURAGE MARKET DEVELOPMENT FOR BIOFUELS

(Mr. SESSIONS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, the Republican Party of this country is dedicated to coming to Washington, DC, and serving the people who believe that America's greatest days lie in our future. But there is also incumbent within that promise the opportunity to present new and better ideas that will help this country to deal with the things that lay ahead of us.

Yesterday, in the Rules Committee, Congressman MICHAEL BURGESS from Texas offered an amendment that would have doubled the tax credit for making biodiesel from recycled restaurant grease from 50 cents a gallon to \$1 a gallon. This comes as a result of Mr. BURGESS' working firsthand with people within his district who are trying to solve problems of not only air pollution, but also to take things that might normally be dumped into a recycle bin that ends up going somewhere to sit in a landfill.

Mr. Speaker, I think that Congressman BURGESS deserves the respect of this House for new and better ideas that will help make sure that America is facing the problems that lie ahead of us and to make sure that we have answers for it.

I congratulate Congressman BURGESS for bringing these ideas forward, and I hope we will continue to have other Members of this body do the same.

#### FOXES NEEDED TO GUARD HEN-HOUSE SPEAKER

(Mr. PRICE of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, taxpayer funded luxury travel is not accorded to our brave men and women serving the cause of liberty. However, the new Democrat leadership believes they deserve just that.

While the previous Speaker of the House was afforded the use of a military aircraft as a security precaution following 9/11, it didn't include the amenities being sought by the current Democrat Speaker, room for 42 passengers, a crew of 16, state-of-the-art entertainment and communications and a private bedroom. Nonetheless, that which was good enough for prior leadership is apparently just not good enough for the new leadership.

Just a few months ago, Speaker PELOSI told the American people that Democrats were committed to a new direction in the way our government does business. At a cost of \$15,000 an hour it should go without saying that this is certainly a new direction, one which frankly disgusts all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, spending watchdogs should be part of the new Democrat majority's budget, and they should be watching themselves. This has been a disgrace.

#### ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Cau-

cus, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 139) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

#### H. RES. 139

*Resolved*, That the following named Members be and are hereby elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

(1) COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION.—Mr. Brady of Pennsylvania, Ms. Zoe Lofgren of California, Mr. Capuano, Mr. Gonzalez, Mrs. Davis of California.

(2) COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT.—Mr. Gene Green of Texas, Ms. Roybal-Allard, Mr. Doyle, Mr. Delahunt.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### ADVANCED FUELS INFRASTRUCTURE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ACT

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 133 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

#### H. RES. 133

*Resolved*, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 547) to facilitate the development of markets for alternative fuels and Ultra Low Sulfur Diesel fuel through research, development, and demonstration and data collection. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Science and Technology. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Science and Technology now printed in the bill. Each section of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any

amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, since this is the first time we are adopting a rule that will allow Delegates and the Resident Commissioner to vote in the Committee of the Whole, does the rule allow for a separate vote on any question once the Committee rises?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Rule XVIII contemplates automatic, immediate review in the House of certain recorded votes in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. As a point of clarification on the inquiry, so any question may be put to a separate vote once the Committee rises?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under clause 6(h) of rule XVIII, both affirmative and negative decisions of the Committee of the Whole may be reviewed in the House under circumstances in which votes cast by Delegates were decisive in Committee.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Further inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may state.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Under what circumstances will a separate vote not be allowed?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will not automatically rise for such an immediate review in the case where votes cast by Delegates were not decisive.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Further inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may state.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. When a vote is not decisive, but a question put loses, is there any opportunity for any Member, certified Member of the House, to ask for a separate vote?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under clause 6(h) of rule XVIII, immediate review in the House occurs automatically when recorded votes cast by Delegates were decisive, without regard to whether the question was adopted or rejected. In ordinary proceedings of the house on the ultimate report of the Committee of the Whole, the House considers only matters reported to it by the Committee of the Whole, which would not include propositions rejected in Committee. Simply put, an amendment rejected in the Committee of the Whole is not reported back to the House.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. On any question put?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Not if it is rejected in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I thank the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

For purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER). All time yielded during consideration of this rule is for debate only.

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. WELCH of Vermont asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 133 provides for consideration of H.R. 547, the Advanced Fuels Infrastructure Research and Development Act, under an open rule. The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate equally divided between the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Science and Technology.

The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill, except for clauses 9 and 10 of rule XXI. The rule makes in order the Committee on Science and Technology amendment in the nature of a substitute, now printed in the bill, as an original bill for the purpose of amendment, which shall be considered for amendment by section with each section considered as read.

The rule authorizes the Chair to accord priority in recognition to Members who have preprinted their amendments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Finally, the rule provides one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this open rule and the underlying bill. As this Congress is well aware, our country faces a pressing need to chart a new energy future. In the crisis of global warming, it is real, it is urgent, and it requires our immediate action.

Furthermore, there is a growing recognition that our reliance on fossil fuels and foreign sources of energy threatens our economic future and our international security.

□ 1030

We as a Nation must seize opportunities, not miss them, to be a world leader and promote our own domestic economy, to take steps similar to what Brazil has done and has successfully demonstrated with the reliance on increasing access to biofuels.

Today, the Chair of our Science and Technology Committee, the Member from Tennessee, Chairman GORDON, with the assistance of the ranking member, the Representative from Texas, Mr. HALL, are providing us with an opportunity to take a concrete step forward to increase the use and the supply of alternative renewable fuels through research and development.

These alternatives provide hope for reducing our impact on global warming

while giving a boost to our local and national economies. The particular beneficiaries of success in building capacity for biofuels will be our rural economies, Mr. Speaker.

We have a potential, if we embrace it, in facing the challenge we face with energy, to revitalize our rural economies. What this bill will do is a number of things. It will fund research to make renewable biofuels more compatible with existing infrastructure. One of the practical problems that we face in making biofuels generally available is infrastructure challenges.

Right now, the low sulfur fuels that are potentially available can do damage to the basic pumps and tanks that are in the 160,000 gas stations across this country. Ultra-low sulfur diesel fuel has just 3 percent of the sulfur in traditional diesel. But current technology does not allow for the easy testing to ensure that this standard is met.

This is the second area where the bill will help, by establishing clear national standards for testing that will allow verification about what the sulfur content is in our biofuels. New low-cost testing methods will give rise to consumer confidence and create the possibility for greater demand.

To that end, this bill will make alternative fuel compatibility information more available to the public. You know, the expansion of biofuels is going to mean additional revenue options for local farmers, like those in my State of Vermont, and a cleaner environment with less dependence on foreign oil.

As gas prices rise, we are further reminded that we are held hostage by a single source of fuel that threatens our economy, constrains our foreign policy, and does damage to our environment. The most basic level, the budgets of our seniors and our schools, our farms, and our families are strained by high energy prices.

All of the time we are exporting dollars to import energy, we are depriving our local economies of job creation potential. This legislation takes small but very specific steps that will bring us closer to a readily available source of fuel that is local and can have tremendous potential for our local economies.

We are moving in a new direction. Our first step in this Congress, the 110th Congress, last month was when we stood up to Big Oil and we rescinded tax cuts that went to an industry that had been enjoying record profits, and instead put that money into research and opportunities for alternative renewable energy sources.

Many of us come from States that have been taking steps to focus on energy independence and clean energy sources. My own State of Vermont has established a utility called Efficiency Vermont that actually makes benefits for Vermonters by finding ways to use less energy, keeping money in our pockets.

We have created a clean energy fund, something in effect that we are on a

start to do with the legislation we passed in the 6-for-06. We established appliance efficiency standards that when implemented can save Vermonters and other citizens from States that have joined us millions of dollars in energy costs.

You know, in addition to just the very practical steps this legislation is taking, having government assist in coming up with standards to measure what biofuel content is, having government help come up with research money so that we can add additives to these low sulfur, less polluting fuels, helping our small businesses, the mom and pop convenience stores that have gas pumps, and would face an expense of \$30,000 to \$200,000 to retrofit or to replace existing facilities in order to be able to dispense the new fuels that our private market is producing, this is a concrete step where government is helping on the energy front, helping small business by assisting and coming up with practical low-cost ways to make it easy to dispense this fuel and get it to the consumer.

These are steps where the government is acting as a partner with industry, a partner with our small businesses and doing some things that require the practical and efficient application of resources of the people of this country.

Mr. Speaker, there is also another element to this bill that I think is very important for the 110th Congress. This is a bipartisan piece of legislation, presented by the Science and Technology Committee. I want to quote some remarks that Chairman GORDON made at the outset. What he said, when he took the reins of that committee as the new chairman was this: "I made a promise that this would be a committee of good ideas and a committee of consensus. We are here to solve problems. In fact, the entire Congress is here to solve problems."

Mr. GORDON and his committee, with the ranking member, the gentleman from Texas, have presented to us a bill that has broad bipartisan support. Why? Because it is practical. It does something concrete. It recognizes we have an energy crisis that requires action, and it has found constructive ways to address that.

The committee allowed the process to be open for new ideas, inviting Members to present amendments. The chairman then came before the Rules Committee, Mr. Speaker, and asked for an open rule so as to permit Members of this body who may have amendments that will strengthen or improve this legislation to have those considered by the full Congress.

So what this bill does is two things: one, it presents us with a practical step that we can take that helps continue to move us in the right direction on energy independence, on reducing global warming, and on building our local economies.

Second, it is a model of how we can work together, the presentation of

good ideas in a bipartisan piece of legislation in an open rule where other Members are invited to present relevant and thought-out ideas that may improve this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule, and I rise to express my appreciation to my friend from Hartland, Vermont, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this rule and the underlying legislation, H.R. 547, the Advanced Fuels Infrastructure Research and Development Act. I congratulate Science Committee Chairman BART GORDON and Ranking Member RALPH HALL on their efforts; and I applaud my colleague, the Rules Committee Chair, Ms. SLAUGHTER.

I extend my congratulations to my colleague, Ms. SLAUGHTER, for granting such a fair and judicious rule. I am very proud to stand here extending that congratulations to my friend and colleague.

Mr. Speaker, in his January 24, 2007, State of the Union address, President Bush called for the increased use of renewable and alternative motor fuels. As the 110th Congress begins, alternative fuels and advanced technology vehicles have already received a good deal of attention, especially in discussions over U.S. energy security. The rising cost of oil, the country's dependence on foreign oil, the debate over global warming, and the concern with air emissions have led to a heightened interest in developing clean and alternative energy sources and facilitating their use by the American consumer.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that the Congress is in the forefront of this research and our effort to look for alternative energy sources.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 547 is a good bill that authorizes \$10 million for the Environmental Protection Agency to launch a research and development program aimed at making alternative fuels more compatible with the Nation's existing petroleum-based fuel infrastructure.

It also directs the EPA to develop portable, inexpensive, and accurate methods for fuel suppliers to test the sulfur content of diesel fuels. While biofuels such as ethanol are regarded as clean-burning alternatives to fossil fuels, it is clear that they can corrode or compromise pipes and storage tanks designed for petroleum products.

Now, unfortunately, retailers themselves often bear the cost of solving this problem and revitalizing the old infrastructure. This bill tasks the EPA with testing additive and other technologies to ease such problems. With new findings we will be able to mobilize the infrastructure necessary to distribute and dispense alternative fuels. With so much emphasis being placed on the development of these alternative

fuels, it is only fitting that we develop the infrastructure that is necessary for us to handle those new alternative sources of energy.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is very important to point out that in the 109th Congress legislation that is virtually identical to this, H.R. 547, was introduced to help facilitate the marketing of alternative fuels to consumers. In fact, the provisions of H.R. 547 are, as I said, virtually identical to section 15 of H.R. 6203, which was introduced last year.

Now, H.R. 6203, the Alternative Research and Energy Research and Development Act, was sponsored by our colleague from Illinois, Mrs. BIGGERT. And, Mr. Speaker, I have to say that that legislation which is virtually identical to this was passed under suspension of the rules by a voice vote. It was passed unanimously.

Democrats and Republicans in the last Congress came together on the 29th of September, clearly a time where there was a lot of division, and yet we came together on this very important piece of legislation designed to help us find ways in which we can deal with the infrastructure challenges of putting new alternative sources of energy into the hands of consumers in this country.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I said before, I applaud this open rule. I commend Chairwoman SLAUGHTER for her first attempt at beginning to open up this legislative process to all Members. Frankly, I was wondering exactly when it would happen. However, I feel it is necessary to point out, as I have said before, that this almost exact same bill did pass under what is known as suspension of the rules. I know that that is an inside baseball, an inside baseball issue here, Mr. Speaker.

Suspension of the rules means that there is little or no controversy to an issue. It is required to have a two-thirds supermajority vote with 20 minutes of debate on each side. So that is the way this legislation passed the last time. I mean, I think it is very safe to say that consideration of this measure, H.R. 547, could have been very appropriately provided for under suspension of the rules, or even as was requested by the distinguished ranking minority member of the Committee on Science, Mr. HALL. In his discussion with Chairman GORDON, the discussion was, why do we not bring this under unanimous consent?

I made the same proposal yesterday in the Rules Committee. I understand that the new majority does in fact want to have an opportunity to point out that we are going to be considering an issue under an open rule. I commend them for that. I am just saying that it is very, very easy to bring a non-controversial issue that will likely have unanimous support at the end of the day under an open rule.

Now, while I think that the research and development of clean alternative energy sources is highly critical to our Nation, I hope that in the future, in the

future that we can save productive, yet noncontroversial, bills for consideration under the provision known as suspension of the rules, or under unanimous consent agreements which we easily could have propounded.

I hope that we can grant open rules. I hope that we can grant open rules to pieces of legislation that are very crucial and frankly where there is disagreement, where we can see what James Madison envisioned as that clash of ideas, because that is really when the open amendment process is very, very worthwhile and we can engage in extensive and vigorous debate. I know we are going to have amendments that are going to be considered on the floor today.

□ 1045

I suspect that most of them will be passed, and I suspect that there will be bipartisan passage of those amendments. And so when I am talking about the future and open rules, I hope that when we do deal with that Madisonian clash of ideas, we are able to do it under an open amendment process.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday at the Rules Committee there were seven amendments that were offered by Members, which did require protection, point-of-order protection, which, as we all know, is something that the Rules Committee can do. One amendment would have doubled the tax credit for making biodiesel from recycled restaurant grease. Now this is an issue that came forward by Dr. MIKE BURGESS from Texas, and I know my colleague on the Rules Committee from Dallas, Mr. SESSIONS, is going to be talking about this amendment.

This is a very, very creative way which will help us address this issue of alternative sources, and it is being done privately. And the notion of providing a tax incentive to deal with the utilization of restaurant grease for biodiesel is, as I said, a very, very interesting and innovative concept, and we could have allowed it to be considered during the debate here on the floor. But to my disappointment, these amendments were not made in order.

As I said, the Rules Committee does have the power to do this. And I would say that as we look at this new-found openness and opportunity for debate, I hope very much that when we have creative amendments like this that could be considered, the Rules Committee would do what the Rules Committee often has done in the past, and can do, and that is waive points of order so that a creative idea like this can come forward.

Mr. Speaker, I am overjoyed to be here in strong support of this open rule. And as I said, I look forward to many, many more open rules as we deal with controversial questions that the American people want us to address in the future. The Democrats pledged regular order and a transparent and fair legislative process, and I am very glad, I am very happy and

very grateful to see it beginning at this point.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, just before I yield to the next speaker on our side, I want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) for his support for this open rule. As he knows, and I think the Members of this body know, the Chair of the Rules Committee, the Member from New York, is completely committed to fair debate.

And also, what we have seen is that there has been vigorous debate on the legislation that has already come before this body, resulting in votes of passage that included substantial support from the other party. So we have had a significant increase in the level of bipartisan support for the legislation that this body has passed.

Chairman GORDON and Ranking Member HALL have presented to us a bill that will be considered by the body, that has broad bipartisan support. They had an open amendment process in effect in their committee.

Chairwoman SLAUGHTER and the Rules Committee, with the support of the Member from California, presenting this bill once again on an open rule process. This side is committed to fair debate, and the Rules Committee will act in ways that are consistent with that.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Ms. MATSUI).

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) for yielding me time. He has quickly become an excellent contributor to the Rules Committee.

Mr. Speaker, Federal energy policy has been lagging behind forward-looking States like California. It is now time for the Federal Government to lead America's transformation to a clean energy economy.

Here in Congress, we must enact smart policies that demonstrate a serious commitment to changing the way this Nation produces and consumes energy.

In the House, we took an important first step as part of the 100-hours agenda when we repealed \$14 billion in subsidies and incentives for oil companies, and redirected that money to a clean energy fund.

That legislation sent a clear and strong signal to our constituents and to industry. I can tell you that businesses, universities and research institutions in my hometown of Sacramento are enthusiastic about helping America move forward on clean energy technologies.

One of those technologies, biofuels, has tremendous potential to decrease our dependence on foreign oil, and if we are serious about incorporating alternative fuels into the economy, we need to ensure that our infrastructure is compatible with them.

I am a cosponsor of H.R. 547 because it is a commonsense next step on

biofuels. Chairman GORDON's legislation will allow for research and development to ensure that alternative fuels, such as E-85, biodiesel and advanced biofuels can be handled by our gas stations and pipelines. This is a smart investment because it makes a lot more sense to modify the existing infrastructure than to rebuild it.

I hope all my colleagues will be able to support this important legislation. But this is just a first step. We know that Congress must continue to send signals that we are serious about transitioning to a clean energy economy. That means supporting the range of technologies, including clean alternative sources of energy such as wind, solar, geothermal and biomass, as well as energy-efficient technologies for buildings and transportation.

Congress and the administration should not pick winners and losers. There will be no magic bullet. When it comes to research and development, we must hedge our bets.

I look forward to working with my colleagues in the 110th Congress to move toward a clean energy economy effectively and expeditiously. This is the most important domestic priority for Congress and a generational challenge for the Nation. There is absolutely no time to waste.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, at this time I am happy to yield 5 minutes to our very hardworking member of the Rules Committee, my friend from Dallas, Mr. SESSIONS.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, we are here today to debate noncontroversial legislation that will help to develop markets for biofuels and ultra-low sulfur diesel fuel through research and development.

And I am very, very pleased, and I appreciate the majority's decision to suspend its policy of a closed rule without regular order. I hope that this will not prove to be a unique circumstance, and one in which we will continue to see more open rules like the one which this legislation is being considered today.

However, I also believe that we are missing an important opportunity to improve this legislation by offering an additional provision to be considered that was offered yesterday in the Rules Committee by our colleague, Dr. Michael Burgess from Texas.

Congressman BURGESS' amendment would have doubled the tax credit for making biodiesel from recycled restaurant grease from 50 cents a gallon to \$1 a gallon, thereby encouraging its further use and production. This incentive would encourage the marketplace to reduce petroleum use and the pollutant associated with removing this grease without removing arable land from food production.

Mr. Speaker, this technology works. This technology is something that we need to do more of. But, this amendment is not germane; it requires pro-

tection from a point of order, which is what the Rules Committee's job is all about. Unfortunately, yesterday, the Rules Committee voted it down along party lines with every Democrat on the committee voting to prevent this amendment from getting the protection that it would need to be considered by the House. Said another way, good ideas don't necessarily pass in the Rules Committee.

This amendment would allow the House to consider new and innovative ways to achieve our goal of energy independence in a responsible way. And I am disappointed that my Democrat colleagues on the committee prevented us from debating that and passing that in the bill today.

I support Congressman BURGESS through his thoughtful legislation to provide incentives for the free market to create new, responsible and leading-edge solutions to end our dependency on foreign sources of energy.

I hope, despite the setback that he will likely encounter today, that Congressman BURGESS will continue to offer his amendments in the future, and I also hope that he will continue to come up to the Rules Committee to make sure his ideas, thoughts, are well understood and communicated.

Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee is open for business. That should mean that the best thoughts and ideas that may or may not have been considered throughout the process of going through regular order would be permissible in the Rules Committee. Good ideas should find the light of day upstairs in the Rules Committee, and it is my hope that the majority will continue to allow not only an open process, but will perhaps allow itself to engage in these ideas for the betterment of people who want us to make sure that we work not only in a bipartisan way, but solve, through creativity, the problems of this great Nation.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) for yielding me the time to speak on this open rule, and I congratulate him for managing his first rule in this body.

And I should say that after listening to the previous speaker, my friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS), I have a bad case of whiplash, first, because when his party was in the majority, he routinely supported closed rules and, second, because when his party was in the majority, I can't recall a time when he supported waiving germaneness rules for a Democratic amendment.

Now, having said that, I want to tell my colleagues that the gentleman from Vermont is part of an extraordinary new group of Members who are helping to change the culture in Washington. And I thank him for bringing forward this open rule. These new Members, the "majority makers," as the majority

leader likes to call them, were elected to this body because they stand for change. They stand for openness, transparency and honesty.

They spoke truth to power during the 2006 elections, Mr. Speaker, and they are here to do what is in the best interests of their constituents and the American people.

Mr. Speaker, with this open rule, the gentleman from Vermont is carrying forward the promise these new Members made to the voters.

Now, some of us who have been around here for a while and lived under the previous Republican leadership may have forgotten what an open rule looks like. I thought it was extinct, except on appropriations bills. But the rule that we are considering today is open, and that means that any germane amendment offered by any Member, Democrat or Republican, can be debated and voted on by this body. It is the way a deliberative body should act.

Now let me assure my friends on the other side of the aisle that this is not the only open rule that you will see in this Congress. This is the return of the House of Representatives as a deliberative body.

And I am also pleased to note that with this open rule we have equaled, in 1 month, the number of open rules provided by the previous Republican majority on nonappropriations bills in the 2 years of the 109th Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud that this new majority has moved in such a fashion, and I am proud that we were able to organize this House and, at the same time, pass meaningful legislation that will affect everyday Americans across this great Nation. A higher minimum wage, stem cell research, reduction in student loan interest rates, an increase in Pell Grants, ethics reform to clean up the culture of corruption that existed in the previous Congress, these are just a few of the accomplishments of this new majority in just 1 month.

Now we are moving on to the next phase, Mr. Speaker. Most of the House committees are organized, and they are beginning to hold hearings and they are producing legislation. The Transportation and Infrastructure Committee and the Judiciary Committee recently held markups. The Ways and Means Committee and Financial Services Committee are scheduling markups as we speak. Legislation these committees produce will come to the Rules Committee, and we look forward to trying to bring that legislation to the floor in a more open and honest fashion than we experienced in the previous Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the 110th Congress is a new Congress, but it is also a different Congress, and I am pleased to be able to serve with new Members like Mr. WELCH of Vermont, who is managing this open rule; KATHY CASTOR; MIKE ARCURI; BETTY SUTTON; along with DENNIS CARDOZA, who is also new to the Rules Committee. These Members are ushering in a new era in helping

shape this new direction for the House of Representatives.

So I want to thank my friend from Vermont for the time. I congratulated him on this open rule, his first, but certainly not his last.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CARDOZA).

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Vermont for yielding me the time and for his able leadership on this rule.

□ 1100

I rise in full support of the rule on H.R. 547.

As a new Member of the House Rules Committee, I am very pleased that we were able to have an open rule so quickly in the 110th Congress. This rule will allow an open and honest debate on one of the most important issues facing our country: energy independence.

H.R. 547, the Advanced Fuels Infrastructure Research and Development Act, addresses an extremely important, however often overlooked, component to our emerging domestic biofuels industry: pipeline and storage infrastructure.

When ethanol and other biofuel additives are mixed with traditional fuels, it can cause disruptions to the pipeline infrastructure through corrosion and contamination, even clogging. These small obstacles should not be impediments to the full development of the biofuels industry, but they are still issues that must be addressed in order to move forward.

This important legislation we are considering today would authorize funds to EPA and the Department of Energy to develop a program for alternative bio-based fuels and low-sulfur diesel fuels to be more compatible with existing infrastructure used to store and deliver petroleum-based fuels to the point of final sale.

In California's San Joaquin Valley, we are watching the development and progression of our domestic biofuel industry with a particularly close eye. We have some of the most fertile agricultural land in the country. My district alone grows over 200 different kinds of crops, contributing over \$5 billion of the \$30 billion agriculture industry of our State.

But as we are blessed with our soil, we are similarly blessed and cursed by our geography. The steep mountains on both sides of the valley create a trap for air which in turn creates some of the worst air quality problems in the entire Nation. We are currently in a severe ozone non-attainment area and quickly moving towards an extreme level for both ozone and particulate matter. Limited emissions from ethanol blends and other biofuels have the potential to contribute to our increasingly dangerous air quality levels.

My colleague Ms. ANNA ESHOO and I will be offering an amendment during

general debate on H.R. 547 to expand the current areas of research covered under this legislation to include strategies to minimize potential impacts of volatile emissions from biofuels. Our amendment exemplifies the importance of this open rule. Neither Ms. ESHOO nor I sit on the Science Committee; however, through this open rule, we are able to weigh in on important legislation on behalf of our constituents.

While I realize that the bill may have passed by unanimous consent last year, clearly numerous Members are interested in offering amendments, and I am pleased that our leadership has provided this opportunity to Members on both sides of the aisle.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support this open rule.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I congratulate my colleague Mr. CARDOZA on his very thoughtful statement and want to say that I am very pleased that he and my other California colleague, Ms. ESHOO, are looking forward, through this open amendment process, to offering their proposal. He stated very correctly that neither of them serve as members of the Science Committee, but by virtue of having an open amendment process, they will have an opportunity to participate. So I join him in stating that I hope very much that as we look at issues where we see great controversy in the future that we will be able to have Members participate in a way that Members will be able participate today on this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ARCURI).

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague and friend from Vermont for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, before I begin, I would just like to respond to something that my colleague from Texas said just a few moments ago with respect to good ideas in the Rules Committee. I happen to agree with him. I think that the proposal was a very good idea, and it is something that certainly I would think very strongly about supporting. However, I voted against it because I felt that there were questions of both germaneness and also I felt that by not going through the committee process, it would somehow make it less likely that that bill would pass, and that was the reason that I voted against it. It had absolutely nothing to do with a partisan issue, but more because I feel it is a good idea and it would stand a better chance of passage by working through the committee process. So I think it is important that we point out here that the Rules Committee is, in fact, a committee that recognizes good ideas and supports good ideas; and simply because we disagree about issues does not mean we do not support good ideas on our side of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of an open rule on this bill, and

I am pleased that my colleagues on the Rules Committee, including those on the other side of the aisle, voted unanimously to approve this rule. That level of support speaks volumes about the importance of bringing the Advanced Fuels Infrastructure bill to the floor of this Chamber for consideration.

During Science Committee Chairman GORDON's remarks before the Rules Committee yesterday, he pointed out an issue that requires our utmost attention if we as a Nation ever hope to truly address our Nation's addiction to oil. The issue is that cellulosic ethanol and other biofuels are highly corrosive and not compatible with the fuel distribution infrastructure currently in place to transport them in our country.

Biofuels are the wave of the future. Continued domestic production and use of biofuels will reduce air emissions, diversify our energy supply, and decrease our dependence on foreign oil. A classic trifecta, if you will.

Unfortunately, this transportation barrier imposes increased cost burdens and could slow the transition we hope to make away from fossil fuels. The Advanced Fuels Infrastructure bill takes a giant first step in the right direction to address the biofuel infrastructure problem by tasking the Environmental Protection Agency to develop additives, blendstocks, technologies, and other methods to make biofuels less corrosive.

Members of my staff joke that I am hooked on talking about cellulosic ethanol. I am more than hooked. I think I would say I am addicted. No pun intended. But the truth be known, I would rather be addicted to some type of energy that is produced domestically rather than a foreign or fossil fuel that is produced somewhere else other than in this country. And so are many of my colleagues in this Chamber. Like me, they understand the substantial benefits that biofuels like ethanol will provide for our Nation's growing energy demand.

We in Congress and our counterparts at the State level also realize the role which government has to play in developing cost-effective methods of producing these fuels. Last December my home State of New York awarded \$14.8 million to build and operate a cellulosic biomass-to-ethanol demonstration plant in Rochester, New York. A professor at Cornell University in Ithaca, New York, was recently awarded a \$10 million grant to upgrade Cornell's industrial biotechnology laboratories and improve researchers' abilities to liberate sugars from woody biomass and convert them into biofuels. In addition, the Biorefinery in New York Project is about to embark upon a \$20.6 million public-private partnership to demonstrate commercial-scale cellulosic ethanol production in Lyonsdale, New York. Half of that \$20.6 million is private investment from a Texas-based energy company that will be pumped directly into the New York State economy. For too long

New York State has been exporting money out of state to meet our energy needs. Now we are importing those dollars back.

The President's fiscal year 2008 budget request includes many misdirected funding cuts; however, it does include a \$292 million grant for research and development programs to promote biofuels, most notably the wide-scale production of cellulosic ethanol. This figure is more than double the fiscal year 2006 appropriation of \$119 million. Cellulosic ethanol plants are starting to pop up all across Upstate New York and the rest of the Nation thanks to top-notch researchers.

I stand here today very proud to support this open rule.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, at this time I am very happy to yield such time as he may consume to the very distinguished ranking minority member of the Committee on Science, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL).

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

And just to comment, this bill was originally introduced by the 109th Congress as H.R. 5658 and included in Congresswoman BIGGERT's comprehensive energy R&D bill, 6203, which was passed by the House under suspension of the rules. And I see no reason why this one couldn't have been handled that way. As a matter of fact, I am a cosponsor with the ranking member of the Energy Subcommittee, BOB INGLIS, and with the chairman of the full committee, Chairman GORDON, and Mr. LAMPSON. Actually, at leadership's suggestion and working together with our leadership over here, I sent a letter to Chairman GORDON requesting that he bring this up on the floor under unanimous consent agreement. It could have easily been done and bypassed the Rules Committee.

It is easy to bring an open rule up when there is not any opposition to it. I hope they will follow this pattern for the rest of this session.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE).

(Mr. INSLEE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, this is a great bill and cellulosic ethanol is great from a global warming perspective because it simply recirculates carbon through the atmosphere. It doesn't add any additional carbon. It is simply that the plant takes it out of the atmosphere. They crush the plant, burn the fuel. It is a cycle. It doesn't add any net increase.

But I want to make sure Members understand this bill is just a beginning of what we need to do. Brazil is totally energy independent today because they have gone to an E-85 system. They burn fuel that is 85 percent ethanol. But I talked to the person in Brazil that made this happen, and he told me one clear lesson. If you don't do something to compel the oil and gas dis-

tribution system to put in E-85 pumps, they don't do it. Now, they in Brazil had to adopt some policies to compel the installation of these E-85 pumps because there is a competitive reason. The oil and gas industry doesn't want to put in these pumps to compete with their oil and gas. So this is a start to demonstrate why the use of cellulosic ethanol is very allowable in Brazil. They pump this stuff all over the country all the time. But we are going to need to take another step to get those E-85 pumps built to fuel our flex-fuel cars. This is a first step. There is more to come.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am just going to close the debate on this spectacular open rule myself; so I reserve the balance of my time at this juncture.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCNERNEY).

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Advanced Fuel Infrastructure Research and Development Act, and I also thank my colleague from Vermont for his leadership on this open rule.

I have dedicated my entire career to developing new sources of energy, and I am pleased that we are making it easier to incorporate biofuels into our everyday lives. Current practices have taken us where we are today, but we need to expand our options to fight clean fuels and viable alternatives to conventional fuels. Diversification of our energy supply is the only way to rein in our country's increasing need to import oil from foreign countries.

The bill we are voting on today is a good step toward making biofuels, such as E-85 ethanol and biodiesel, easier and less expensive to access and use. This is a very good first step toward energy diversification, but we are on a long haul to sustainability.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying bill.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I will continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman from California if he is ready to close. I am the only remaining speaker on my side and will reserve my time until the gentleman is finished.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, in light of the fact that my new friend from Hartland is prepared to close debate, I will do the same on our side.

I do so to simply say that I do rise in strong support of this open amendment process. I congratulate Mr. GORDON, I congratulate Mr. HALL, and the other Democrats and Republicans who have come together to do what we did in the last Congress, to pass this very important legislation which is designed to allow us to focus on the infrastructure challenges that we as a Nation will have to deal with as we pursue ethanol, biodiesel, all of the multifarious forms

that are alternative ways of our dealing with the energy needs of this country.

□ 1115

Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege of representing the Los Angeles Basin, part of it, along with other great colleagues of mine on both sides of the aisle. We have very serious environmental challenges there; air quality problems are very great, and doing what we can to encourage these alternative sources has been a priority for my Governor, Arnold Schwarzenegger, and for Republicans and Democrats alike.

One of the things that we like to argue is that Republicans and Democrats and Independents, everyone likes to breathe clean air. Everyone wants to have an opportunity to deal with the challenges that are out there, whether it is global warming or just the overall concern about environmental quality. It is very, very important for us to do that.

I believe that this is legislation that is going to pass, probably unanimously. I can't imagine anyone voting against it. I know that there are some thoughtful amendments that will come forward on this.

But I do want to also say, Mr. Speaker, that it is a new day. It is a new day because we have seen a change, a change from what we have seen in the first several weeks of this Congress.

Now, I know that a number of people talked about the fact that we have had a vigorous discussion and debate over the issues that my friend from Massachusetts mentioned, the issues of college loans, stem cell research, the minimum wage increase. But we know that those are issues that enjoy broad bipartisan support among the American people. I was proud to have supported the stem cell research legislation, identical to what I voted for in the last Congress. There would have been no reason for me to oppose it.

But, frankly, I will say that as I looked at the other issues that were included in that 6 for '06 package, Mr. Speaker, I opposed them because they didn't allow for the kind of opportunity to improve the legislation that we are going to see today.

Now, again, it is hardly necessary, because this could have been done under suspension of the rules; and my challenge to my very distinguished colleagues is, as Mr. HALL said so eloquently, we don't need to simply have an open rule for the sake of an open rule on an issue that everyone agrees over. There is complete agreement on this issue. What we need to have is an open and vigorous debate when we have disagreement and, again, a clash of ideas, as James Madison envisaged it when he talked about the establishment of this great institution.

So, Mr. Speaker, I praise my colleagues for putting together this effort. I congratulate once again my colleague from New York, Ms. SLAUGHTER, the

distinguished new Chair, the first woman to chair the Rules Committee. I congratulate Mr. MCGOVERN, who so ably is carrying on his responsibility in the new majority on the Rules Committee. I look forward to working with my colleagues as we pursue our goals of making sure that we do the best thing for the American people, and that is to come together to address the very crucial public policy questions that confront us.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for his kind remarks about the Chair of the Rules Committee, Ms. SLAUGHTER. I also thank him, as we all do, for his support on both the open rule and the merits of this legislation.

The bottom line here is, we are all in it together. We know that we have major problems to solve. One of them is global warming and one is energy independence. This legislation is a practical step that was brought to us by the cooperation of both sides of the aisle on the Science and Technology Committee.

The Rules Committee is presenting an open rule. There will be more to come. Its commitment is to fair debate, and it is going to have to balance the responsibility of making decisions about how best to allow this body to debate clearly and directly the major issues that come before this Congress.

We can make progress by working together. It is our goal to continue to do so. That requires that the committees be given an opportunity to do their work. Amendments are going to be brought up in committees and recommended or rejected. That was done in this case. It is going to be the commitment of the Rules Committee to make the debate on all legislation that comes before this body as fair as it possibly can be.

Mr. Speaker, this is an important step. We have to give the American people some confidence that we can take concrete steps to move ahead, and that is legislation, day by day, week by week, month by month, year by year, where we are moving in the right direction.

What we have done on energy in less than a month is move away from an excessive and damaging reliance on fossil fuels by passing two pieces of legislation, if this passes, that move us in a new direction. That is the right thing for this country; it is the right thing for Republicans and Democrats to work together to achieve.

I urge a "yes" vote on this rule and on the previous question.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 133 and rule

XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 547.

□ 1123

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 547) to facilitate the development of markets for alternative fuels and Ultra Low Sulfur Diesel fuel through research, development, and demonstration and data collection, with Mr. McNULTY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. LAMPSON) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. LAMPSON).

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, energy is on everyone's mind these days. The price of fuel has been rising and awareness of the extent to which we are dependent upon foreign sources of oil has grown. At the same time, in an effort to reduce emissions of air pollution, we are also transitioning to cleaner fuels.

The good news is that we have developed and are continuing to develop alternative fuels and cleaner-burning versions of our current petroleum-based fuels. But we must ensure the availability of infrastructure and equipment for transporting, distributing and utilizing these new fuels at a reasonable cost.

For a number of reasons, biofuels such as ethanol and biodiesel are often incompatible with many components of the present-day infrastructure, forcing distributors and retailers to make heavy investments in new hardware if they want to carry these fuels. H.R. 547 initiates a program to research ways to mitigate many of these problems and make bio-based fuels more compatible with the country's petroleum-based infrastructure, thus avoiding the massive costs to the country of a whole new infrastructure.

The bill also initiates a program to develop less-expensive, easier-to-use testing methods and equipment for verifying the sulfur level of clean diesel fuels. Since infrastructure is used for various fuel products with sulfur content, ranging from 15 to 5,000 parts per million, there is a concern that distributors and retailers may sell fuel with sulfur beyond 15 parts per million limits of ULSD, ultra-low sulfur diesel. This simply gives retailers and distributors a way to ensure the quality and regulatory compliance of the fuels they sell.

To ensure consistent specifications throughout the fuels market, H.R. 547

instructs NIST to begin developing standards for biofuels as they would for conventional, petroleum-based fuels. There is also an authorization of \$10 million to carry out all programs within this bill.

Mr. GORDON secured numerous endorsements and support for this bill from groups as diverse as convenience store and truck-stop owners, petroleum marketers and retailers, the Renewable Fuels Association, API and the NRDC. Given the relatively small cost, the very specific concerns it addresses and the carefully negotiated language and endorsements, it would be a shame to make this bill something it is not by amending it with provisions that are outside the scope or purpose of this bill. I ask my colleagues to please consider this as they bring amendments forward.

H.R. 547 is a good idea, turned into a good, bipartisan piece of legislation. I urge my colleagues to support the bill without making major substantive changes or additions.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise today, of course, in support of H.R. 547, the Advanced Fuels Infrastructure Research and Development Act. It is a good noncontroversial bill that was passed unanimously by the Republican-led Congress last session as part of a larger energy efficiency research and development bill. I am pleased that Chairman GORDON has indicated that we will be addressing other provisions of that bill in the coming weeks and months ahead.

Subcommittee Chairman LAMPSON has already described what this bill does, so I don't really need to go into that again. But I feel it is important to point out that this bill not only addresses our energy independence issues, but it also addresses clean energy issues by working to mitigate potential problems that can rise from transporting clean fuels, such as ethanol and ultra-low sulfur diesel. By doing this, it ensures that clean burning and alternative fuels can be a viable part of our Nation's transportation fuel mix.

Energy independence and clean coal are not just buzzwords that you hear thrown around these days. They are noble and necessary goals that we are one step closer to by the passing of this bill. This bill may be a small piece of the puzzle, but every piece is important and every piece is needed.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1130

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time at this time, and I am prepared to yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HALL of Texas. I do have requests for time, if the gentleman pleases. I yield 3 minutes to Mr. WELLER, the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. WELLER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my good friends

from Texas for this opportunity to speak during general debate.

I rise in support of the basic bill that is before us, H.R. 547. I voted for it last year when it passed the House unanimously, like all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, and of course I stand in support of this legislation today. However, I believe we do need to make some minor improvements to the bill.

We have made a tremendous amount of progress. The energy bill of 2005 has caused hundreds of millions of dollars of new investment in biofuels production. In Illinois, in the State that I represent, we are anticipating up to 50 new ethanol and biodiesel plants, thanks to the energy bill.

When I talk to the local farmers that I represent in Illinois, they are pretty happy with \$4 prices of corn. When the energy bill was passed into law, the price of corn was about \$1.65 a bushel. So we are seeing the fact that rural America and small-town America, and rural Illinois and small-town Illinois were clearly the biggest winners in the energy bill.

But if you also care about energy independence, if you care about addressing the issue of climate change, we need to promote greater use of biofuels.

The basic bill makes progress when it comes to infrastructure, but we need to do more. You know, E-85, 85 percent blend ethanol fuels, offer part of that solution. As I drive or travel throughout the district I represent or my constituents travel throughout the district, many of them are looking to purchase E-85. They bought a flexible fuel vehicle; they want to contribute to our commitment for energy independence, they want to see investment in America rather than sending money overseas, so they want to buy E-85. And they question, why is it not available? Why do I have a hard time finding E-85 pumps at the gas stations that serve my community? And that is because there is a bureaucratic logjam in the certification process for the pumps, the infrastructure that is used for the installation of E-85.

I have an amendment which is germane to this bill that I am going to be offering. I believe it deserves bipartisan support that I will be offering to this bill, this legislation to, of course, not only draw attention to this issue, but to help remove the logjam to the certification process.

We talk to some of the big distributors, some of the big operators, fuel stations across America; it is because of this issue that they have delayed or stalled installation of E-85. If you truly want to encourage the use of biofuels, if you believe that E-85 is part of that solution, if you believe that we need more installation of more infrastructure to distribute E-85 in America, then I ask that you support the amendment that I will be offering as we move through the processes of the bill.

Again, I support the basic bill. It is bipartisan legislation. I believe the

amendment, which I worked on with the former Speaker of the House, Speaker Hastert, as well as a bipartisan group of Members, is a good amendment that deserves bipartisan support.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have no more speakers. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may state his inquiry.

Mr. TERRY. Is it correct to state that the standing committees of the House are authorized under rule XX of the House rules?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's question should be addressed in the full House, not in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. TERRY. Further parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may state it.

Mr. TERRY. Are we allowed to ask parliamentary inquiries in the Committee of the Whole?

The CHAIRMAN. In the discretion of the Chair, as they relate to the proceedings of the Committee.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, further parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. TERRY. Is it correct that the organization of the standing committees of the House were organized pursuant to previous enacted statutory laws?

The CHAIRMAN. Once again, that may be a proper inquiry to the House, but not to the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. TERRY. I understand. Then, Mr. Chairman, parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may state his inquiry.

Mr. TERRY. Is it correct that the organization of the standing committees of the House were organized pursuant to previous enacted statutory laws?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may state that inquiry to the full House.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may state his inquiry.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, since the House is sitting as the Committee of the Whole, are the Delegates and Resident Commissioner permitted to vote on all matters in the Committee of the Whole House?

The CHAIRMAN. Under clause 3(a) of rule III, the Delegates and Resident Commissioner possess the same powers and privileges as Members in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Further inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may state it.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. So I am correct in understanding that there are only some instances, namely the case

of an adoption of an amendment, where a Member may request a revote in the full House. Is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN. It is the understanding of the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole that the special order under which it is proceeding (H. Res. 133) provides that any Member may request a separate vote in the House on amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the Science Committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Further inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may state his inquiry.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I appreciate the Chair's indulgence, because this is the first time for a number of questions, and I appreciate the opportunity. If there is any question or if the amendment is defeated, is there any opportunity for a duly elected Member to request a revote in the full House?

The CHAIRMAN. Only on amendments that are adopted to the amendment in the nature of a substitute or on that substitute.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Further inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may state his inquiry.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. It is my understanding that under the rules the House has adopted, that on any matter in which the votes of the Delegates are decisive in the vote taken in the Committee of the Whole, that those votes shall be retaken in the full House and that the Delegates and Resident Commissioner shall not be permitted to vote in the full House. Is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN. On recorded votes, yes, the gentleman is correct.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Further inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may state his inquiry.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. How is the Chair going to determine if the votes of the Delegates and the Resident Commissioner are decisive?

The CHAIRMAN. The test for determining whether the votes of the Delegates and Resident Commissioner are decisive under 6(h) of rule XVIII is a "but for" test, that is, would the outcome have been different had the Delegates and the Resident Commissioner not voted. The absence of some Members is irrelevant to this determination.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Further inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may state his inquiry.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I thank the Chair. If the Chair determines that the votes of the Delegates and the Resident Commissioner are not decisive, but a Member believes that in fact they are, is it appropriate for a Member to lodge a point of order against the Chair's determination?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair's decision on a question of order is not subject to an appeal if the decision is one

that falls within the discretionary authority of the Chair. The Chair's count of the number rising to demand tellers, a recorded vote, or the yeas and nays is not subject to appeal, nor is the Chair's count of a quorum.

Likewise, the Chair's count of the votes of the Delegates and Resident Commissioner is not subject to appeal.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Further inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may state his inquiry.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. If the Chair determines that in fact the votes of the Delegates and the Resident Commissioner are not decisive, will the Chair include those numbers when reporting the tally of the vote?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Further inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may state his inquiry.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Given that, then it is my understanding, is it correct that the number of individuals allowed to vote in the Committee of the Whole shall be 440, and the number in the full House shall be 435?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Further inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may state his inquiry.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. So the Delegates and the Resident Commissioner may not vote in the full House; is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN. It is the understanding of the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole that the gentleman is correct.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Further inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may state his inquiry.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Do the Delegates and the Resident Commissioner count for the purposes of establishing and maintaining a quorum of the Committee of the Whole House?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Further inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may state his inquiry.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. If the Delegates and Resident Commissioner are allowed to vote on everything in the Committee of the Whole and they vote on procedural issues that may in fact affect the substantive nature of a bill, and if a procedural vote is lost within a decisive margin, is there a mechanism to have a separate vote in the full House on that procedural vote?

The CHAIRMAN. Under clause 6(h), an immediate vote in the House is contemplated under those circumstances, given a recorded vote.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. On that procedural vote?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I thank the Chair. Are the Delegates and Resident Commissioner permitted to vote on the question of the Committee rising?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I thank the Chair for his indulgence.

Mr. WU. Mr. Chairman. I would like to commend my new colleague from Texas, the Chairman of the Energy and Environment Subcommittee, Mr. LAMPSON for his great work on this bill, and also Chairman GORDON for his leadership on alternative fuels.

We rely on fuel everyday. While the market is awakening to its ability to sell alternative fuels like E85 or biodiesel blends many of these new fuels have compatibility issues with the existing delivery systems in place in America. Fuel depots, fuel pipelines, fuel trucks and local gas stations are not truly ready to ship, store, or sell these fuels to consumers.

These fuels can cause corrosion of tanks and pipelines, clog filters, and pose danger of thermal and oxidative instability. The cost of replacing or building new infrastructure is sometimes infeasible for fuel suppliers, frequently small business owners.

H.R. 547, The Advanced Fuels Infrastructure Research and Development Act, meets the needs of fuel shippers and suppliers so they can use alternative fuels in existing infrastructure. It directs the Department of Energy (DOE) and the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) to research and develop new technologies and methods such as fuel additives, blend stocks, and easier tank reconditioning methods that would allow fuel retailers, shippers, and storers to use alternative fuels in existing infrastructure, significantly reducing costs both for businesses and consumers.

The bill also directs the DOE and NIST to develop affordable, portable, quick and accurate ways to test the sulfur content at pump stations to make sure it complies with EPA regulations of 15ppm, and directs NIST to develop a physical properties data base and a set of standard reference materials for alternative fuels, which is not unlike the ones that currently exist for standard fuels.

If we are truly serious about bringing alternative fuels to consumers, we need to make sure that we can store, deliver, and retail these fuels with the same efficiency and safety as we deliver traditional fuels.

I urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 547, and again want to recognize the leadership of Chairman LAMPSON and GORDON for bringing this important legislation through the Science and Technology Committee, and Speaker PELOSI for bringing this legislation to the floor as part of her efforts to stem global warming.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 547, the Advanced Fuels Infrastructure Research and Development Act. I commend the Chairman of the Science Subcommittee for bringing this legislation forward.

Last year under the Republican Majority, the House passed this same legislation as part of a more comprehensive bill offered by the gentlelady from Illinois, Mrs. Biggert. This legislation, called the "Alternative Energy Research and Development Act," died in the Senate. But it's never too late to take bipartisan action on good ideas.

Reducing America's dependence upon foreign oil is an economic and national security

imperative. Achieving this goal requires us to exercise creativity and common sense. In particular, we must find ways to expand our use of biofuels in a safe and cost-efficient manner.

H.R. 547 provides very specific mechanisms to address the challenge of integrating ethanol and biodiesel fuels into our petroleum-based transportation system. In particular, this bill directs the EPA and the NIST to mitigate the harmful effects caused by the physical and chemical incompatibility of these fuels within the current infrastructure. H.R. 547 also tackles the quality concerns associated with Ultra Low Sulfur Diesel and biofuel production.

As the Ranking member on the Energy and Mineral Resources Subcommittee I remain committed to working with my colleagues across the aisle to reduce our nation's dependence on foreign oil. In contrast to H.R. 6, the regrettable measure the House passed a few weeks ago that increases our dependence on foreign oil, this bill constitutes a productive step forward—and I look forward to supporting other measures like it.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 547, the Advanced Fuels Infrastructure Research and Development Act. I am pleased we are taking steps to make biofuels, like E85 ethanol, easier to access and use.

The President's State of the Union Address discussed the importance of diversifying America's energy supply, explaining that the way forward is through technological advancements. I support this approach and with Chairman GORDON and Ranking Member HALL's Leadership, the Science and Technology Committee can have an important role in accelerating these efforts by promoting research and development funds for all alternative fuels in order to use more domestic sources of fuel and less imported oil.

Given that coal is our most economical and abundant domestic resource, with a 250-year supply, I believe clean coal technology and coal-to-liquids transportation fuels must be part of any solution to achieve greater energy independence. I look forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle on energy related issues so that we clearly understand the benefits of clean coal technology and I thank Chairman GORDON and Ranking Member HALL for their commitment to examine all alternative fuels, including clean coal technology.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the bill shall be considered by sections as an original bill for the purpose of amendment, and each section is considered read.

During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chair may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD designated for that purpose. Those amendments will be considered read.

The Clerk will designate section 1.

The text of section 1 is as follows:

H.R. 547

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

*This Act may be cited as the "Advanced Fuels Infrastructure Research and Development Act".*

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 1?

The Clerk will designate section 2.

The text of section 2 is as follows:

#### SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

*The Congress finds that—*

(1) *in order to lessen United States dependence on foreign sources of petroleum, and decrease demand for petroleum in the transportation sector, the Nation must diversify its fuel supply to include domestically produced biofuels;*

(2) *while ethanol has been successful in the market place as a fuel additive, newer biofuels may present unique challenges that may render the fuels incompatible with the current fuel transportation and delivery infrastructure, placing the burden of costly refurbishment and construction on fuel distributors and retailers;*

(3) *chemical additives to the fuels may mitigate the negative impacts of some biofuels on existing infrastructure and preclude costly retrofitting or installation of new biofuel compatible infrastructure and transportation systems;*

(4) *in order to mitigate air pollution and comply with Federal mandates, Ultra Low Sulfur Diesel fuel was introduced into the marketplace in 2006;*

(5) *fuel labeled Ultra Low Sulfur Diesel may accumulate more than the statutory limit of 15 parts per million of sulfur when transported through multiple pipelines, tanks, and trucks to the final point of sale; and*

(6) *fuel distributors and retailers may inadvertently take delivery of fuel labeled Ultra Low Sulfur Diesel with more than 15 parts per million of sulfur without a practical means of verifying sulfur content.*

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 2?

The Clerk will designate section 3.

The text of section 3 is as follows:

#### SEC. 3. BIOFUEL INFRASTRUCTURE AND ADDITIVES RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.

*The Assistant Administrator of the Office of Research and Development of the Environmental Protection Agency (in this Act referred to as the "Assistant Administrator"), in consultation with the Secretary of Energy and the National Institute of Standards and Technology, shall carry out a program of research and development of materials to be added to biofuels to make them more compatible with existing infrastructure used to store and deliver petroleum-based fuels to the point of final sale. The program shall address—*

(1) *materials to prevent or mitigate—*

(A) *corrosion of metal, plastic, rubber, cork, fiberglass, glues, or any other material used in pipes and storage tanks;*

(B) *dissolving of storage tank sediments;*

(C) *clogging of filters;*

(D) *contamination from water or other adulterants or pollutants;*

(E) *poor flow properties related to low temperatures;*

(F) *oxidative and thermal instability in long-term storage and use;*

(G) *microbial contamination; and*

(H) *problems associated with electrical conductivity;*

(2) *alternatives to conventional methods for refurbishment and cleaning of gasoline and diesel tanks, including tank lining applications; and*

(3) *other problems as identified by the Assistant Administrator, in consultation with the Secretary of Energy and the National Institute of Standards and Technology.*

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 3?

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. BURGESS

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk to section 3.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Mr. BURGESS: Page 4, line 17, strike "and".

Page 4, line 18, redesignate paragraph (3) as paragraph (4).

Page 4, after line 17, insert the following new paragraph:

(3) *issues with respect to increased volatile emissions or increased nitrogen oxide emissions; and*

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment which was preprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will ensure that the Environmental Protection Agency Biofuels Research and Development Program, which was authorized in the underlying bill, will be cognizant of the potential clean air issues arising from additives to biofuels. Specifically, those issues arising from volatile emissions which occur during the fueling process and nitrogen oxide emissions which occur during combustion.

In my home State of Texas, and particularly within my district in north Texas, there has been some debate about the nitrous oxide emissions from biodiesel. It is my hope that the new data from the Environmental Protection Agency will put this debate to rest and allow biodiesel production to move forward unimpeded. But the debate raises an interesting question. As we look to increase the use of alternative fuels and the accompanying infrastructure, how do we make certain, how can we be sure that we do not hurt our efforts, that we do not roll back our efforts to clean our air?

I understand that there are some additives that may already exist for alternative fuels. In fact, I know of one approved for use in Texas for the low emission diesel that has proven to be safe and effective at reducing the nitrous oxide emissions in ultra-low sulfur diesel. It has also been shown to cut the nitrous oxide emissions in biodiesel and to eliminate the NO<sub>x</sub> bump that some researchers have shown for biodiesel. But we must examine this issue as we move forward to other alternative fuels and additives.

This amendment will ensure that we prevent any emissions problems associated with the new additives early, at the research and development stages, before any additives may get to market.

I think the underlying bill is a good bill, and I thank my friend from Texas for introducing it. I look forward to supporting it again this year. But I think this amendment can improve the bill to ensure that we address any clean air problems, address them at the beginning before they start.

Mr. Chairman, I was to be joined in this debate by the gentleman from New Jersey. Let me just state a couple of his points in the absence of his being here, and I will submit his statement for the RECORD.

He is concerned that in his own State of New Jersey we undergo a constant struggle of clean air issues. This

amendment will go far to ensure that any new fuels that are added to our market to decrease our dependence on foreign oil do not have an adverse impact on the quality of air that our citizens are now breathing.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. ESHOO TO THE  
AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BURGESS

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. ESHOO to the amendment offered by Mr. BURGESS:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted on page 4 after line 17, insert the following new paragraph:

(3) strategies to minimize emissions from infrastructure; and

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. A point of order is reserved.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Chairman, first, I strongly support the use of biofuels to diversify our fuel supply and to reduce our dependence on imported oil.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, parliamentary inquiry. Mr. Chairman, do we have copies of the amendment?

Ms. ESHOO. It is at the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will distribute copies of the amendment.

Mr. BURGESS. I thank the Chairman.

□ 1145

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Chairman, I think what is important to understand in this debate is that there are significant technical obstacles that have to be addressed before biofuels can be widely deployed.

Many Members this morning during this important debate have spoken about the importance of biofuels. This amendment to the amendment actually kind of drills down, as it were, into the specifics and I think strengthens a very good bill.

The bill before us recognizes the specific infrastructure challenges that we are already facing in implementing the Renewable Fuels Standards program which was enacted in the 2005 Energy Policy Act. It anticipates the challenge of the more widespread use of biofuels, which I think most of us are for, by authorizing the EPA to initiate a research and development project to make biofuels more compatible with the existing petroleum storage and distribution system. If there is not distribution in this system, it simply is not going to work.

Now, the reason I am offering this perfecting amendment to Mr. BURGESS' amendment, along with my colleague Mr. CARDOZA, simply requires the EPA, as part of this R&D program, to consider strategies to minimize emissions. I want to repeat this, because these are the two operative words, to minimize emissions that may be released when biofuels are blended, stored, and transported.

We all understand that pollutants contained in gasoline and other motor

fuels are released into the atmosphere as a result of combustion, and I think Mr. BURGESS speaks to this, but his amendment is more about combustion. This is about emissions also occurring as the result of evaporation while fuel is held in storage tanks or transferred on and off tanker trucks.

In the case of gasoline containing ethanol, evaporative emissions of certain substances, specifically VOCs, can be greater than they would be from conventional gasoline. In certain regions trying to comply with the Clean Air Act, and I think Mr. BURGESS, certainly Mr. CARDOZA and others are driven by understanding that where they have ground-level ozone, these emissions could be problematic, in fact, increased.

A September 2005 report by the Bureau of Air Management for the State of Wisconsin estimated that evaporative emissions of VOCs of gasoline containing 10 percent ethanol, E-10, held in the fuel distribution system will be 15 percent higher than conventional gas.

In my view, it makes important sense for EPA to not only examine strategies that will reduce these emissions as part of this R&D program, but that it instructs them to do that.

I want to thank Chairman GORDON for his support of this effort, and I would like to yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from California (Mr. CARDOZA) who is also a part of this amendment.

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the gentlewoman from California, and while I support my colleague from Texas' effort to address emissions concerns, I cannot support his amendment.

Mr. BURGESS' amendment simply directs the EPA and the Department of Energy to study the effect of increased emissions from biofuels. We need to do more than study this problem; and, in fact, both the California Air Resources Board and the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources have studies which show increased rates of VOC emissions from ethanol-blended fuels and fuel tanks and pipelines.

We must develop strategies to minimize these emissions from biofuels now so that we can accelerate the use of biofuels nationwide in the future.

The Eshoo-Cardoza amendment does exactly what needs to be done in law to make that possible.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman insist on his reservation?

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, it appears the secondary amendment is germane, and I will withdraw the reservation; but I do oppose the amendment and ask for a vote on a clean amendment on my submission.

Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes on the Eshoo amendment.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, I will be supportive of the Eshoo amendment if it is offered as a stand-alone amendment, but I do oppose it being offered as a secondary amendment.

I do ask for a consideration of my amendment as a clean amendment. It is stronger. It is more expansive because obviously it addresses the mobile sources, as well as the static sources, that may be a source of emissions.

While Mr. CARDOZA is correct in the issuance of a study, this is a research and development bill; and as such, it is appropriate to study the effects of the emissions of biodiesel and add that concept to the substance of the underlying bill.

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I thank everyone for their interest in this particular matter regarding the subject of alternative fuels generally, but I have to support the Eshoo amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The problem of increased nitrogen oxide emissions with biofuels, and biodiesel in particular, relates to the combustion of the fuel in an engine and not to challenges retailers and distributors are encountering in transporting such fuels, and that needs to be the clear focus point here.

For this reason, we actually removed reference to the NO<sub>x</sub> emissions in the manager's amendment in the committee markup. So Ms. ESHOO's amendment restricts research and development to evaporative emissions from infrastructure.

Therefore, I would support and ask for support for Ms. ESHOO's amendment to that amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) and I thank our friends Ms. ESHOO and Mr. LAMPSON for their efforts, and I rise in support of this bill; but I think the bill can be better, and I rise in opposition to the second-degree amendment because I frankly think it would weaken the Burgess-Ferguson amendment that would really strengthen this legislation.

The amendment that Mr. BURGESS and I are offering would help take a significant step forward in advancing fuel technology and helping to secure our Nation's energy independence, but it also is key to stopping a potential environmental problem before it starts.

I have been a champion for renewable energy technologies and new developments in alternative fuels, and I really believe that we have to ensure that these new technologies do not contribute to the ongoing environmental problems that we are facing today.

While the gentlewoman from California has offered an original amendment and has offered a secondary-degree amendment to our amendment, they sound familiar, but they are very different amendments. I believe this second-degree amendment to our amendment would significantly weaken the improvements that our amendment would make to the bill.

I commend her for her commitment to improving this legislation, but our amendment is more comprehensive and frankly just goes one step further. While her amendment would seek to minimize emissions from stationary sources at the end of the process, like at gas pumps, ours would seek to minimize emissions at both mobile and stationary sources. It is more comprehensive, it is a stronger amendment, and it would help to ensure that we are careful to recognize the possible environmental impacts that these fuels have as they move from production to the end product that ends up in your gas tank.

So in my home State of New Jersey, we undergo a constant struggle with clean air issues. Our amendment would go so far as to ensure that any new fuels that are added to our market to decrease our dependence on foreign oil do not have an adverse impact on the quality of the air that our citizens are breathing.

Let me be clear. This is a good bill. I intend to support the bill. I think it can be better. I think it can be better with the Burgess-Ferguson amendment. I think it would be weakened with this Eshoo second-degree amendment.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, as a representative of a farm State, one of the leading ethanol producers in the United States and proud to be part of this new movement of using renewable fuels to lessen our dependence on foreign oil, and I think it is important that we broaden our portfolio of fuels so that we can meet our ultimate goals of energy independence.

Now, there has always been, particularly with two States, California and New York, a traditional, and I have to admit I do not understand the depth or the reason behind those States' bias toward biofuels, but I find it odd as we stand here today trying to promote biofuels to lessen our dependence that we now have a secondary amendment that puts some restrictions on the use of biofuels that will actually slow the promotion of biofuels. I think it is odd the contradictory nature of let us have a biofuels bill, but then let us put in amendments that will eventually slow it.

Make no bones about this, this secondary amendment is an attempt to slow down the process of rolling out biofuels. It is a poison pill to a reasonable approach to the issue, the base bill from BURGESS and FERGUSON.

If you represent a State that is a major player or a player in biofuels production, you will want to vote against this poison pill amendment.

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word on the Burgess amendment.

I would first, Mr. Chairman, like to yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO).

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I will be brief.

I appreciate what my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are saying. I think it needs to be very, very clear to all the Members of the House who are going to cast a vote on this to understand what the underlying bill seeks to do.

It is an infrastructure bill. It is not a combustion bill. It is an infrastructure bill, and that is why I have offered the amendment to the amendment. It deals with infrastructure. It directs the EPA to minimize. We all want VOCs minimized. It is the way biofuels are going to become effective in our country, and how they are stored and how they are handled is going to give rise to what we are all seeking.

This is a bipartisan effort, and I do not think anyone should get confused about what we are voting on. I wish that as we did our outreach to Mr. BURGESS that they would have been part of the same effort.

So we are all for biofuels. We want to make them effective and, again, remember that this is an infrastructure bill. It is not a combustion-type bill. So I thank the gentleman for giving me time.

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, this bill was very narrowly drafted to address a particular issue facing the country's energy infrastructure. This amendment does not fall within that narrow focus of the bill. The program areas which are in this amendment would be better addressed by a stand-alone bill or in some other manner.

The amendment specifically refers to nitrous oxide emissions. Nitrous oxide emissions do not occur from pipelines. This bill is attempting to address the issue of transporting additives or other fuels in a manner that makes it easier and less expensive for retailers to be able to accomplish that task.

I think there are going to be many opportunities for us to discuss the engines and the burning of these fuels within those engines at other times during this year, and I would hope that we would have the support joining us in making it happen.

□ 1200

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMPSON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BURGESS. I am going to assume that the gentleman is not speaking in favor of increased nitrous oxide emissions. But then do I understand, would the intent of the bill be that the truck that is transporting the ethanol to the retailer would not be allowed to burn biofuels?

Mr. LAMPSON. I absolutely support biofuels and have a significant interest in wanting to do so because I believe that it is going to bring a great deal to our economy, our independence and our security. What we are trying to do here

is to craft a piece of legislation. Not to not address the things that you are bringing up right now on how engines process this fuel, but on how we can transport it from one place to another so that someone can get access to put it in their engine.

Mr. BURGESS. But under that scenario you would not be able to burn biofuels in that 18-wheeler that was caught carrying the ethanol to the retailer.

Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that this was a research and development bill, and we keep hearing it referred to as an infrastructure bill. I appreciate that infrastructure will follow from that research and development, but as we are studying this problem, as we are studying it from the origination, whether it be the cornfield or the Fry Oil to Fuel program, we are studying it from its origination to its end point. In my estimation, that end point should be the emissions that are emitted at the fuel pipe.

Mr. LAMPSON. Reclaiming my time, I would just point out to the gentleman that, yes, this is research and development, but it is not research and development on engines and how engines burn fuel, but on pipelines and infrastructure to transport that fuel so they can ultimately be placed into engines. There are going to be many opportunities for us to discuss how emissions come from these fuels.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMPSON. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. TERRY. So as I understand this secondary amendment on the infrastructure, would it also apply, then, to tanker trucks that would haul the biofuel to determine if there are any emissions from the evaporation? That is what I understand.

Mr. LAMPSON. Reclaiming my time, only during the evaporative process of that. Not from the engine of that truck, if it is emitting something different from that.

Mr. TERRY. My fear is that because now the secondary amendment will jeopardize the ability to transport ethanol and biofuels from the Midwest because it may evaporate along the way, taking it to a refinery to be blended. That is the danger here.

Mr. LAMPSON. That is precisely what the amendment to the amendment is attempting to address. I think that this is an appropriate process right now. I support the Eshoo replacement and hope that all my colleagues will do the same.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO) to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote, and pending that, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk. The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HASTINGS of Florida:

Page 3, line 23, insert "The Assistant Administrator is encouraged to utilize Land Grant Institutions, Historically Black Colleges and Universities, Hispanic Serving Institutions, and other minority-serving institutions among other resources to undertake research for this program." after "point of final sale."

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment to the Advanced Fuels Infrastructure Research and Development Act.

This legislation is an important step in gathering the most current research to implement the vision of fuel independence and energy efficiency set forth by this Congress.

I commend the hard work of my colleague from Tennessee, the chairman of the Science and Technology Committee, Mr. GORDON, who has brought forth this legislation, and the ranking member and I look forward to its passage.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment to this legislation today because I feel that as we move forward with energy reform, it is important to recognize the tremendous contributions to scientific research and academia made by land grant institutions, historically black colleges and universities, Hispanic-serving institutions and other minority-serving institutions.

This amendment specifically recommends that the assistant administrator of the Office of Research and Development of the Environmental Protection Agency utilize the wealth of knowledge currently available at the research-oriented universities throughout our great Nation.

As a graduate of Fisk University and Florida A&M University, I have seen firsthand the outstanding research generated by faculty and students alike. An example of these contributions at Florida A&M is the Environmental Sciences Institute. The institute has consistently partnered with Federal agencies to furnish informative environmental policy research. The research has included 40 publications during the 2005–2006 academic year and the services of Dr. Larry Robinson on the National Research Council.

Fisk University also embodies this important mission in its designations as a core research center for NASA and international recognition as a scientific research institution.

And since we are dealing with energy, I would urge that the president of

Fisk University is the former Secretary of the Department of Energy.

The recent development of the Center for Physics and Chemistry of Materials has established an outstanding resource for chemistry studies with the support of the National Science Foundation and the Department of Defense. This center generates over 34 publications a year and holds several patents for application by the United States Air Force.

Mr. Chairman, I am confident that this amendment will emphasize the importance and value of the research conducted by the phenomenal network of Land Grant Institutions and other universities represented by many of us in this great Congress. It is vital that we acknowledge the role of research institutions as community partners in the implementation of congressional mandates.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this commonsense amendment to foster these partnerships for a prosperous future of responsible energy use.

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I just wanted to indicate our support for the amendment proposed by Mr. ALCEE HASTINGS. We will support it. We think it is a good amendment.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have just received a copy of this amendment, but I am somewhat bemused by the amendment. I guess that what the author means is that he is saying that he doesn't believe that the assistant administrator of the Office of Research and Development of the EPA would even consider these institutions.

It would be my belief and understanding that this individual would consider all institutions where there is appropriate research being done that could be helpful. I am somewhat bemused by it. I am tempted to offer an amendment that would have the individual look at institutions in my fair State that are doing wonderful work. In fact, each one of us could offer amendments that would identify particular institutions in our jurisdiction.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. The only thing that I am pointing out is the significance of land grant institutions. I think the gentleman makes a valid point, but this doesn't obviate the point that you are making.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Reclaiming my time, I appreciate the gentleman's comment. I assume that the gentleman would then believe that all 435 and now 440 of us ought to offer amendments to have the individual at EPA look specifically at the institutions in our jurisdiction. And doesn't that really do a disservice to the process that we are in having the EPA look at the appropriate institutions that may have the greatest amount of knowledge?

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I am amused by your bemusement. At the very same time, I certainly understand the dynamic you have put forward. If you choose to make such an amendment and if 434 other Members and the Delegates choose to do so, I would assume that is their responsibility. I am discharging mine.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Reclaiming my time, I appreciate that.

Mr. Chairman, I remain amused and bemused. We all acknowledge the contributions of land grant institutions and historically black colleges and universities. We have those in our good State of Georgia. They make wonderful contributions, absolutely wonderful contributions. I think this amendment, however, points out kind of the folly of what is going on here with this bill.

As you know, Mr. Chairman, this legislation came through last year under suspension, passed by, as I understand it, unanimous vote. I think that we will all support this because it is motherhood and apple pie. But it doesn't add to the appropriate discussion of the real issue here, which is trying to make certain that we have an energy-independent policy for our Nation.

I think that we are just kind of playing on the margins, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WELLER OF ILLINOIS

Mr. WELLER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WELLER of Illinois:

Page 4, line 17, strike "and".

Page 4, line 18, redesignate paragraph (3) as paragraph (4).

Page 4, after line 17, insert the following new paragraph:

(3) issues with respect to certification by a nationally recognized testing laboratory of components for fuel dispensing devices that specifically reference compatibility with alcohol blended and other biofuels that contain greater than 15 percent alcohol; and

Mr. WELLER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, let me begin my commending my friends, Chairman GORDON and Ranking Member HALL, as well as my friend, Mr. LAMPSON, who is managing the bill this morning.

My amendment is pretty basic in what we are trying to achieve. I want to note that the former Speaker of the House, who, as you know, is recovering from surgery and is not able to be with us, is one I have worked with on this amendment. But this is an amendment that deals with infrastructure, as noted by those that are arguing for this bill which we all support. Our focus is infrastructure and research, affecting infrastructure of biofuels.

If we look back to when we passed the Energy Policy Act of 2005 through Congress, we included a renewable fuel standard of 7.5 billion gallons by the year 2010. Due to passage of this increase, which essentially doubled the amount of biofuels established under the renewable fuel standard, we have seen a tremendous amount of growth in investment in the biofuels industry in Illinois, my home State, as well as across America.

Currently, there are 110 ethanol plants in production, with 70 more under construction, producing today 5.2 billion gallons of ethanol as well as biodiesel. Our farmers are seeing \$4 a bushel of corn, as well as \$7 soybeans because of the increased demand for biofuels.

The President, as well, in seeing the need to reduce our dependence on foreign oil, announced in his State of the Union a call for a renewable and alternative fuel standard of 35 billion gallons by 2017, 10 years from now. In order for the biofuels industry to move forward and achieve these aggressive goals, we need to make sure that an infrastructure exists that can deliver fuel to the consumers.

I am often asked by my constituents, why are there so few E-85 pumps as they travel. Unfortunately, issues have arisen with the E-85 certification by Underwriters Laboratories, which is an independent, not-for-profit, product safety certification organization that tests products and writes standards for safety. UL's worldwide family of companies and network for service providers include 66 laboratory testing and certification facilities serving customers in 104 countries.

UL began work to develop standards for E-85 fuel dispensers in early 2006 at the request for certification for such a dispenser from its primary manufacturer. It was reported in August 2006 that the manufacturer was to get UL approval for their E-85 pump. UL has looked at the application for quite a long period of time. Signals were given that the approval was imminent to the point where the manufacturer issued a press release. Yet in October of 2006, UL has suspended existing authorization on components for E-85 pumps, which they had previously approved over the years, and began and are continuing a stakeholder process to develop new standards for all components in the finished pump.

According to UL, there are no documented reports on any issues, field incidents, safety issues or documented reports related to E-85 components that have been authorized, or the pumps themselves. This process could take at least another year, possibly more, depending on numerous factors.

UL will not give a timeline for completion of the standards. It is possible once these standards are published, manufacturers of E-85 pumps will have to retool their operations to comply.

□ 1215

The impacts of certification issue are already being felt in my district as well

as across this country. Even though UL is continuing to engage State and local governments and fire marshals with their findings, suspension of the installation of E-85 tanks has started to occur.

While States like Michigan and Minnesota are allowing continued use with special monitoring, States like Ohio have already prohibited all dispensing of E-85 blended fuels pending UL approval or listing. Big retailers, names we recognize, like Wal-Mart and Valero, which previously had announced their intention to install E-85 pumps nationwide, have suspended the installation of any new pumps pending this certification. This represents thousands of fueling stations across the country.

The bill before us requires the Environmental Protection Agency and the Department of Energy's research and development offices to carry out an R&D program of materials to be added to biofuels to make them more compatible with existing infrastructure.

The amendment I have offered today will require EPA and DOE and recognize the impact to research and recognize the impacts any further additives they recommend through the research program may have on issues with respect to certification by UL for fuel dispensers like E-85 and other biofuel blends like biodiesel.

In the United States there are 110 ethanol plants in production with 70 more under construction producing approximately 5.2 billion gallons. There are over 1,123 E-85 fueling stations around the country today, including on Federal property.

In my district alone, there are six ethanol and biodiesel plants, either announced or are moving forward or planned under construction, and 14 fueling stations offering E-85. Unfortunately, the process of bringing more has stalled.

We in this Congress have made a bipartisan commitment to an energy policy which encourages the development and use of E-85 and other blended biofuels. Exporting America's domestic agricultural resources to achieve energy security, energy independence, providing jobs for America is of utmost importance.

Mr. Chairman, I ask bipartisan support for this legislation. E-85 and other blended biofuels are a key part of our strategy. I look forward to working with my colleague in a bipartisan way. Again I ask for bipartisan support for this amendment.

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we like the amendment that Mr. WELLER has proposed and look forward to working with him on this and other things. Thank you very much for your interest. We will indeed support this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DENT

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk and I ask unanimous consent that it be considered at any point in the reading.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DENT:

Page 2, line 12, insert "including hydrogen" after "biofuels".

Page 3, line 8, strike "and".

Page 3, line 12, strike the period and insert "and".

Page 3, after line 12, insert the following new paragraph:

(7) fuel distributors and retailers may transform their business by dispensing hydrogen, reformed on site from various feedstocks, or delivered by pipeline or tube trucks, resulting in new storage, handling, and equipment challenges.

Page 4, line 17, strike "and".

Page 4, line 18, redesignate paragraph (3) as paragraph (4).

Page 4, after line 17, insert the following new paragraph:

(3) challenges for design, reforming, storage, handling, and dispensing hydrogen fuel from various feedstocks, including biomass, from neighborhood fueling stations, including codes and standards development necessary beyond that carried out under section 809 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16158); and

Mr. DENT (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 547, the Advanced Fuels Infrastructure Research and Development Act, is an important bill that seeks to facilitate the development of markets for biofuels and ultra-low sulfur diesel fuel. I am pleased that it is being considered on the floor today.

I supported this language last year when it passed as part of the Alternative Energy Research and Development Act. I am a strong supporter of diversifying our Nation's fuel supply. Our dependence on foreign sources of petroleum is a threat to our economy, threat to our national security, and a threat to our environment.

Promoting the development and implementation of clean domestic sources of transportation fuels will advance our energy independence and reduce the detrimental environmental effects of harmful air emissions. Bio-based fuels, such as ethanol and biodiesel, are an important component of a national energy strategy, which maximizes our domestic resources.

I also believe that hydrogen must play a prominent role in an energy policy that relieves our dependence on foreign sources of oil and minimizes the environmental footprint by improving air quality and reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

This bill will direct the development of additives, blendstocks, technologies and methods which mitigate the negative effect of biofuels on infrastructure and make them more compatible with existing infrastructure used to store and deliver petroleum-based fuels to the point of final sale.

My amendment seeks to acknowledge and address the infrastructure challenges that will be presented by the advancement of hydrogen fuel, which can be made from a variety of feedstocks, including biomass. Specifically, my amendment will, one, direct the Secretary of Energy, in consultation with the National Institute of Standards and Technology, NIST, to consider the challenges for design, reforming storage, handling and dispensing hydrogen fuel from various feedstocks, including biomass.

I believe that key to our energy security is a strategy which incorporates the various technologies and alternative fuels that will coexist in the marketplace.

As we address the important infrastructure challenges raised by the promotion of biofuels and ultra-low sulfur diesel, I also believe it is incumbent upon us to start paving the way for the hydrogen economy. These are consistent technologies that are complementary and that promote alternative development.

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly appreciate the attention the gentleman from Pennsylvania is giving to what is undoubtedly a crucial element of the possible transition to a hydrogen-based economy. But I oppose the amendment because it has no relation to H.R. 547.

This amendment is simply outside the scope of what is a very carefully and narrowly drafted bill to address specific short-term research needs that would allow currently available biofuels such as ethanol and biodiesel and ultra-low sulfur diesel to be distributed in existing pipelines, and use other current liquid fuel distribution technologies. These are all fuels that can be used in a current generation of commercially available automobiles.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania's amendment, in contrast, deals with problems of containing hydrogen, a fuel now derived from natural gas rather than biomass, and distributing it if and when hydrogen vehicles become available.

Hydrogen would require a new distribution infrastructure. So while the amendment uses similar words related to distribution, it is talking about an entirely new generation of distribution technology.

Also, while it is possible that some hydrogen could actually be developed

from biomass, it is not today. So the references to hydrogen derived from biomass in the bill are not really related to the research on hydrogen distribution that would be conducted if this amendment became law.

It is also unclear what would be the funding source for the gentleman's amendment since it establishes a program at the Department of Energy while the funding in H.R. 547 all goes to the Environmental Protection Agency. For these reasons I would ask the gentleman to withdraw his amendment.

This amendment does address an important concern. I ask the gentleman to consult with his colleagues in the Hydrogen Caucus about ways to work the intent of this language into hydrogen legislation that the Committee on Science and Technology is likely to consider as it moves on to other energy research legislation later in the Congress.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to Mr. DENT, the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I do have a great deal of respect for the chairman, but I do respectfully disagree with his contention that this amendment is outside the scope of this legislation.

Clearly the Chair and the Parliamentarian have ruled this amendment germane. And it is germane for a number of reasons. Specifically, biomass is a feedstock, as we know. It can be used in the production of hydrogen. So I am trying to emphasize once again that these are very consistent technologies.

There is \$10 million authorized in this legislation. We just seek to take some of that funding for this amendment. We are not asking for additional funding. Again, as you develop an infrastructure for biomass and biodiesel, developing one for hydrogen is just as essential.

I think that this is entirely consistent, well within the scope of the legislation before us and should be supported by all of the Members of this Chamber. I do have a great deal of respect for the gentleman from Tennessee. I know he is dedicated to alternative fuel development.

But I think we cannot move forward on some aspects of alternative fuels while ignoring hydrogen in a hydrogen-based economy, which is where many of us would like to move at some point in the future.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Chairman, the funding within the bill goes to the Environmental Protection Agency. And I believe in your amendment, the funding for the research on hydrogen goes to the Department of Energy.

Would the gentleman explain how that is going to be funded?

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania to respond to the query of the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, the amendment says that the funding is through the EPA with consultation with the Secretary of Energy.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania will be postponed.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to rise today in support of the Advanced Fuels Infrastructure Research and Development Act. Energy policy vitally impacts our Nation's security, the strength of our economy, and the health of our planet.

Today, high gas prices stretch family budgets. Our addiction to Mideast oil threatens our national security. Increased consumption of fossil fuels contributes to global warming. These issues will dominate the 21st century, our future, and America's role in the world. It requires a new energy initiative, and the Advanced Fuels Infrastructure Research and Development Act is a critical component of that effort.

This bill is aimed at improving the Nation's transportation fuel infrastructure, to improve the storage and transportation of biofuels.

□ 1230

It will facilitate affordable delivery of alternative fuels to gas pumps throughout the country. It is just one piece of a large puzzle. But it is an important move towards a sustainable energy future. We need this legislation to address specific technical problems that hinder the storage and distribution of biofuels. Many of the country's gas stations are not equipped to handle large increases in alternative fuels. Ethanol and other biofuels have unique chemical properties that make them incompatible with much of the country's existing fuel infrastructure.

Despite their enormous promise as a cleaner, homegrown fuel source, biofuels can be corrosive to pipelines and tanks, can clog filters and contaminate water and air with volatile emissions. In the past, these technical problems have created a significant barrier to market acceptance of these alternative fuels.

The bottom line is that it would be enormously expensive to modify existing infrastructure to accept ethanol and other alternative fuels. We need a focused, scientific effort to address this problem. H.R. 547 would allocate \$10 million in R&D monies on new technologies and methods, including additives, blend stocks, and easier tank reconditioning methods that allow gas

station owners to retrofit their infrastructure, significantly reducing costs for businesses and consumers.

It is clear that the United States must take meaningful steps to move away from our dependence on foreign oil. I think we all agree that this is merely a first step. But in order to make alternative fuels financially feasible for American drivers and gas station owners, we need to take some of the small steps like this one today.

I am proud to support this bill. I congratulate my colleagues and urge swift passage.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, we have dealt with on the floor this morning now a second-order amendment. If, when we get to the point of voting, the recorded vote on the second-order amendment, if that vote passes, but it is not decisive, meaning that the Delegates and the Resident Commissioner don't make the difference, is there any way for a Member to get a revote on that second-order amendment once we go into the full House?

The CHAIRMAN. Any Member may demand a separate vote on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I have a further parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may state his further parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. That includes the specific second-order amendment that would have been offered; is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN. Any amendment.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF MICHIGAN

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Michigan specify which amendment he is calling up?

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order against the amendment. I am told by the proponent that he has, actually, two.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair must ascertain which amendment is before the House.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Just so I understand, Mr. Chairman, have you reserved your point of order?

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. I will at this time reserve a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has an amendment that is printed in the RECORD, and he has an amendment which is freestanding. We need to determine which amendment he is seeking to offer.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. The amendment that is printed in the RECORD, sir, is another section of the

bill. This amendment is for section 3, which we are discussing now.

The CHAIRMAN. A point of order is reserved.

The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, line 17, strike "and".

Page 4, line 18, redesignate paragraph (3) as paragraph (4).

Page 4, after line 17, insert the following new paragraph:

(3) issues with respect to where in the fuel supply chain additives optimally should be added to fuels; and

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I think this is going to be an improvement to the bill.

This is a good bill. And what this, my amendment, does is deal with the issue of infrastructure. This bill talks about infrastructure. And we have asked the EPA, in this particular bill, to study what additives we add to make the process better when we are talking about moving alternative fuels through the infrastructure. But that sometimes infers that you are either at the point of origin, the refinery, or the point of sale.

But there are lots of places that we may be able to apply additives in the process of making alternatives fuels viable, and what we are asking with this amendment is very simple and noncontroversial. We are saying, when you are studying what additives to put in, you should also include where is the best place to put those in in the long process.

Our fear here is that we get isolated to only looking at a very small section of where those additives ought to go in this system. And one thing that we know, and we have talked about it here, the gentleman and my friend from Massachusetts made a great argument about the retrofitting gas stations and how important the infrastructure is.

Well, if we don't know where these additives go in the system, we, in fact, may be shooting ourselves in the foot here. All it does is take what is existing in this bill and expand it by saying, don't only look at what, but where, those additives can go in the system to make an improvement in our alternative fuels as we march to the future. Very simple. I would argue it is certainly germane to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from North Carolina insist on his point of order?

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, based on the statements of my friend, I will withdraw my reservation.

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we believe this is an acceptable amendment and thank the gentleman for submitting it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ROGERS).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan will be postponed.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there any further amendment to section 3?

The Clerk will designate section 4.

The text of section 4 is as follows:

#### SEC. 4. SULFUR TESTING FOR DIESEL FUELS.

(a) PROGRAM.—The Assistant Administrator, in consultation with the National Institute of Standards and Technology, shall carry out a research, development, and demonstration program on portable, low-cost, and accurate methods and technologies for testing of sulfur content in fuel, including Ultra Low Sulfur Diesel and Low Sulfur Diesel.

(b) SCHEDULE OF DEMONSTRATIONS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Assistant Administrator shall begin demonstrations of technologies under subsection (a).

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 4?

The Clerk will designate section 5.

The text of section 5 is as follows:

#### SEC. 5. STANDARD REFERENCE MATERIALS AND DATA BASE DEVELOPMENT.

Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the National Institute of Standards and Technology shall develop a physical properties data base and standard reference materials for biofuels. Such data base and standard reference materials shall be maintained and updated as appropriate as additional biofuels become available.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 5?

The Clerk will designate section 6.

The text of section 6 is as follows:

#### SEC. 6. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the Environmental Protection Agency \$10,000,000 for carrying out this Act.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROSKAM

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROSKAM:

Page 5, lines 18 through 21, amend section 6 to read as follows:

#### SEC. 6. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS SUBJECT TO PAY AS YOU GO.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the Environmental Protection Agency \$10,000,000 for carrying out this Act, to be derived from amounts otherwise appropriated to the Environmental Protection Agency for energy research, development, and demonstration activities related to fuels or environmental research and development activities related to fuels.

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. A point of order is reserved.

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Chairman, like so many others who have come to the floor today, I rise in support of the underlying bill, H.R. 547. The underlying measure, without question, is one that is worthy of our support.

All of us, many of us in the course of our journeys to come here, gained the confidence of the electorate by talking about alternative energies and alternative fuel sources. I come from Illinois, which ranks second in corn production and is one of the leading producers of ethanol. In my district, I have over 140,000 residents who are directly employed in manufacturing, and they would greatly benefit from having clean fuels, that is, moving products around.

But as I was evaluating and meeting with my staff to talk about the underlying bill, there was a word that kept popping up in the analysis and that was a key word, new, N-E-W.

I know that in the course of my journey to come here, one of the things that I heard consistently throughout the course of the campaigning was that my constituents, Mr. Chairman, wanted us to live within our means. And so the amendment that I have offered is very, very simple. It directs the EPA that \$10 million authorized for these three new programs that don't currently exist, created under the bill, would have to come from funds that are already appropriated. It is the simple measure of pay-as-you-go. You see, we don't get it both ways. We don't get to act as if we are fiscally disciplined, and yet at the first opportunity, not act fiscally disciplined.

My dad has a phrase that he communicated to me over and over and over when I was growing up and that was this. He said, "Life is choices," and I think we have a choice today to make. This is our first opportunity, with this open rule, to amend a new program that we have seen created in the 110th Congress. We didn't have that opportunity in other bills that have come along. But this is our first opportunity.

A \$10 million appropriation, Mr. Chairman, or a \$10 million authorization, is comparatively small, if you compare it to the overall EPA budget of \$7.7 billion. It is less than one-tenth of 1 percent. But my argument is simple: that we need to show the American taxpayers that they can have confidence in us in these comparatively small programs, so that as we move in and continue through this Congress, as new programs are considered, that they are within the context of fiscal discipline.

Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment today to focus the House's attention on it and to bring the attention of the Nation to it.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may not reserve his time. He either uses his time or yields back.

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT).

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may yield to the gentleman from Missouri if he stays on his feet.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I may

move to strike the last word as I run through the time here, if I do.

I am grateful to the gentleman for bringing this amendment. I think it is exactly the kind of fiscal responsibility that many of us on both sides of the aisle talked about during our campaigns. It is an important thing to have before the Congress.

We have talked about PAYGO for taxes, but this is really PAYGO for spending. This is trying to reprioritize the spending of the Federal Government, to look at spending we are doing now as the first way to pay for spending we should be doing in the future.

I haven't heard anything in the debate today that doesn't suggest that we need to move forward with the bill that the chairman has brought to the floor, that the committee has brought to the floor, that there is a lot of interest in amending this bill in ways that make it better. But there is no real discussion that the underlying bill doesn't do the kinds of things we need to be looking for as we move toward energy independence.

Millions and billions of dollars, however, are authorized with no real requirement for fiscal discipline. In one of the votes we have taken this year in the early bills, the 6 for '06, the implementation of the 9/11 Commission, when we finally weeks after the vote got the cost estimate of the vote, the cost estimate was an estimate of \$30-or-so billion over 5 years. And so we need to be sure that we are doing things that make sense with the people's money.

I think President Reagan, who would have been 96 this week had he lived, said that a government has never voluntarily reduced its size.

One of the ways we can at least maintain the size of the government is, we look at new and worthy things to suggest that the size of the government would not grow just because the needs of the government are changing.

□ 1245

In this bill we ask for the authorization—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

This legislation authorizes \$10 billion in spending to the EPA. And, frankly, the EPA spends a lot of money that could be spent in different ways. In the EPA budget last year \$47,459,367 was spent in projects in foreign countries. I would suggest, in supporting the gentleman's amendment, that probably you could find \$10 million there and, if you couldn't find it there, you could find it somewhere else.

Currently, the EPA has paid for things that establish a coal bed methane clearinghouse in the People's Republic of China or developing or producing a television documentary in China, in Chinese, on mercury pollution or improving environmental monitoring quality and capacity in the

Ukraine. They may all be good things, but none of them as important to American taxpayers as the proposal today. This proposal would allow this bill to move forward, but require the EPA to find the \$10 million for this new program by evaluating the value to the American people and the American taxpayer of their old program.

I think the money that is there to do this can be found elsewhere. I particularly am grateful to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM) for bringing this to the floor as one of our first opportunities to talk about PAYGO for spending.

If we are going to do things that meet the new priorities of the country, it is also an opportunity every time to look at the current spending and to reprioritize what the Federal Government has been doing.

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman insist on his reservation of a point of order?

Mr. LAMPSON. I withdraw my reservation, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I think the two gentlemen who have spoken on this are making very good points.

The EPA, however, has been an underfunded agency, and to take money from one area that has been appropriated is like robbing Peter to pay Paul. And I will give you a good example.

The Energy Star program. The Energy Star program is an investment that we have made in the future to help consumers, and the money that we spend on the Energy Star program, for every dollar that we put into it, we get about \$10 back, a tremendous investment. So it is an area where government can do something positive and save a great deal of money.

What we are trying to do right now is to improve an infrastructure that will give us the ability to have access to cleaner burning fuels, that will give us an access to having a product or products that consumers are demanding, and we do it more safely, more conveniently, and hopefully with less expense.

We believe that the bill as it stands is one that provides for the new dollars necessary to make this project one that could be very appropriate for the citizens of this country. And the bill could save consumers somewhere between \$5 billion and \$30 billion a year, a total of close to \$30 billion on a \$10 million investment. That is one heck of a return, and it is the opposite of what I believe the gentleman, Mr. BLUNT, was talking about a few minutes ago that we want to control the size of government. Government doing good works indeed brings us significant returns. This is an area where there will be a significant return, and we think that new dollars need to go into this program.

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMPSON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

It strikes me that everything the gentleman has said is actually consistent with the underlying amendment.

The amendment that is before the House simply says that it needs to make priorities and make those priorities clear. I take the gentleman at face value that the underlying program and the underlying \$10 million is worthy of investment. But we don't get to have it both ways, it seems to me.

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, the gentleman's amendment says specifically "to be derived from amounts otherwise appropriated to the EPA." To me that means we are going to take money from another project to make this one work. That does not work, in my mind. If we are going to have a new investment that we expect a huge return on, we need to put the money into it and make sure that it is a committed project and we believe it is one that will give us a great return.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the comments from the gentleman from Texas. And I guess one of his comments that this bill would save \$30 billion on a \$10 million investment means that he would support dynamic scoring through CBO, which is something that we have been begging for for a long time.

So I know that you will endeavor to work with us as we move toward dynamic scoring for CBO.

But I find it amusing, distressing actually, that the other side continues to break promise after promise. I read now from "A New Direction for America," which is what the majority party put out prior to the last election, and they said: "Our new direction is committed to pay-as-you-go budgeting, no more deficit spending. We are committed to auditing the books and subjecting every facet of Federal spending to tough budget discipline and accountability, forcing the Congress to choose a new direction and the right priorities for all Americans."

Well, fiscal discipline clearly is not the order of the day today nor is pay-as-you-go. The other side will tell you they have pay-as-you-go; but, in fact, it does not apply to this sort of bill. So it doesn't apply to authorization. So when rules are rules only when you want them to be rules, then they really aren't rules at all. So it really is not pay-as-you-go. It is go and spend, which is the program that the majority party has in place.

This is a great bill. This is a great bill. And I think probably \$10 million is an appropriate amount of resources of the American people's hard-earned taxpayer money to spend on this kind of endeavor. However, we are charged with developing the priorities of the

Federal Government, and, in fact, I believe this to be a priority. But the majority party is charged, when they bring a bill like this to the floor, to say, well, this is indeed a priority but something else has to go to the bottom of the list, in fact, fall off the list to the tune of \$10 million. That is what PAYGO is. You say we are going to spend \$10 million on this, but we are not going to spend it on this. Well, in fact, the majority party hasn't done that. What they have said is that we are just going to continue to spend and spend and spend and spend.

Mr. Chairman, that is not responsible. That is not responsible spending. That is not responsible use of the hard-earned taxpayer money. So I would hope that the new majority would, in fact, embrace the policy that they talk about, which is making certain that PAYGO rules are in effect. In fact, the promise was to have PAYGO rules be in effect for everything, for everything that came to the floor. Well, we haven't seen that, and I look forward to that because I think it is the appropriate way for us to budget and for us to spend.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I would be happy to yield to my good friend from Georgia.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to ask the gentleman from Texas if he is saying that the coal bed methane clearinghouse in the People's Republic of China is more important than this and maybe doesn't need to be looked at versus the \$10 million for this, or developing and producing a television documentary in China on mercury pollution or improving environmental monitoring capacity in the Ukraine, as Mr. BLUNT mentioned, that those are more important and might not be a way to redirect money.

I heard him make the comment of robbing Peter to pay Paul. I thought that was the MO of the majority party, but I guess Peter has to be rich and Paul has to be poor.

But this is something, and I applaud the gentleman for bringing this up, that if we are going to be good stewards of the money, we have got to prioritize our spending.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for those comments.

And I too want to commend the gentleman from Illinois for bringing this issue forward. All of us, when we were out talking to our constituents running up to the last election, all of us heard that we needed to be responsible with the taxpayers' money. So I applaud him for bringing this bill forward so that we make certain, we make certain, that we prioritize in an appropriate way on something that is as important as this piece of legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

First I want to state that I appreciate this open rule and this open dialogue and debate that we have here on the floor of the United States Congress today. It is a healthy process that we are going through, and it is a process that, of course, is designed to perfect legislation or allow that perfect legislation to have an opportunity to be vetted and rise as a perfect piece.

And as I look at this overall proposal to authorize \$10 million to develop an additive so that we can put renewable fuels and particularly ethanol down through the pipeline, Mr. Chairman, I can't help but reflect back upon the beginnings of renewable fuels in the United States of America.

As most people know, I represent the Fifth Congressional District of Iowa. And there, of all the 435 congressional districts, we are number two in ethanol production. By the end of this year, we will be number one in ethanol production. We are number one in biodiesel production of all 435 districts. And also with renewable energy, we are today tied for fourth and will this year be tied at least for second and perhaps first in the electrical generation by wind. That puts us, Mr. Chairman, within the grasp of winning the renewable energy triple crown: ethanol, biodiesel, and wind all tied up in one congressional district.

Now, I raise this issue because I have the great privilege of having grown up and having developed my business and my life and my experience in the epicenter of renewable fuels. And that perspective is so utterly valuable, at least for me. And when I go back to Iowa and have the opportunity to visit the Iowa Senate where I formerly served, I am always proud to shake the hand of State Senator Thurman Gaskill of Corwith, Iowa, who pumped that first gallon of ethanol back in 1978. And from that first gallon, we are here today on the floor of the United States Congress talking about a problem of how to transport all of these billions of gallons of ethanol that we are producing. It is a fantastic transformation that we have taken from 1978 to today. It hasn't been without work, it hasn't been without risk, and it hasn't been without its failures along the way. But it is a glorious success.

And I appreciate the gentleman from Illinois coming forward. And here we are, Iowa is the number one ethanol-producing State in the Union as well, and it produces 26 percent of the ethanol in the country. And it is important to know that the United States has surpassed Brazil in overall ethanol production.

So we have an industry here that is growing. We have an infrastructure that is being established and founded, and we are to this point now where we have so much fuel that we are producing. Not nearly enough, I want to add that. We have to find a transportation way to resolve that issue.

I want to point out also, Mr. Chairman, that of these difficulties that we have had in the past, we have put some tax credits in place, and the private sector has been magnificent in finding solutions. For example, the increase in the production of ethanol out of every gallon of corn has come from a lot of industry-driven solutions, and this transportation problem also can come from industry-driven solutions.

So I want to watch this authorization as it moves through. The private sector has been very, very effective. And yet we will be producing more and more ethanol as the years go by and blending it in. And as we move to cellulosic, of course, this becomes more and more important.

One of the difficulties with this bill also, though, is the component of ultra-low sulfur fuels and the burden that it puts on our jobbers, on our fuel distributors, that they will have one truck and they will have to haul a load of low-sulfur fuel and then turn around and load that up and haul a load of ultra-low sulfur fuel.

□ 1300

As that unfolds, they are going to find themselves in a situation where they will be vulnerable to regulations without any means to determine whether their load actually meets that very tight standard on ultra-low sulfur fuel.

So as this process moves forward, I would remind this body and ask the Department of Energy and the EPA to pay very close attention to finding a way to develop an economic testing system that will allow these jobbers to be in compliance.

So, overall, we have gone by leaps and bounds from that first gallon of ethanol that was pumped back in 1978, and here we are the number one ethanol-producing nation in the world. We have far eclipsed Brazil. Our technology is far ahead of theirs. And this is not just an ability to produce ethanol, but the intellectual property that grows from having done this.

We have the science down and we have the research and development in place and that is growing and multiplying, and as that happens we build more and more expertise. That expertise grows from the epicenter of these renewable fuels out into the regions of the country.

So I would say we will see ethanol flow out to the limits of the corn belt, biodiesel to the limits of the soybean area. We will see the cellulose fill in the gaps. And we are going to see the markets drive this and tax structure be supportive of it.

I am supportive conceptually of this legislation that is before us, and I thank the gentleman for bringing this legislation.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF MICHIGAN

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROGERS of Michigan:

After section 6 insert the following:

**SEC. 7. ENERGY SECURITY FUND AND ALTERNATIVE FUEL GRANT PROGRAM.**

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF FUND.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There is established in the Treasury a fund, to be known as the “Energy Security Fund” (referred to in this section as the “Fund”), consisting of—

(A) amounts transferred to the Fund under paragraph (2); and

(B) amounts credited to the Fund under paragraph (3)(C).

(2) TRANSFERS TO FUND.—For fiscal year 2008 and each fiscal year thereafter, the Secretary of the Treasury, subject to the availability of appropriations, shall transfer to the Fund an amount determined by the Secretary of the Treasury to be equal to 50 percent of the total amount deposited in the general fund of the Treasury during the preceding fiscal year from fines, penalties, and other funds obtained through enforcement actions conducted pursuant to section 32912 of title 49, United States Code (including funds obtained under consent decrees).

(3) INVESTMENT OF AMOUNTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall invest in interest-bearing obligations of the United States such portion of the Fund as is not, in the judgment of the Secretary of the Treasury, required to meet current withdrawals.

(B) SALE OF OBLIGATIONS.—Any obligation acquired by the Fund may be sold by the Secretary of the Treasury at the market price.

(C) CREDITS TO FUND.—The interest on, and the proceeds from the sale or redemption of, any obligations held in the Fund shall be credited to, and form a part of, the Fund in accordance with section 9602 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(4) USE OF AMOUNTS IN FUND.—Amounts in the Fund shall be made available to the Secretary of Energy, subject to the availability of appropriations, to carry out the grant program under subsection (b).

(b) ALTERNATIVE FUELS GRANT PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Energy, acting through the Clean Cities Program of the Department of Energy, shall establish and carry out a program under which the Secretary shall provide grants to expand the availability to consumers of alternative fuels (as defined in section 32901(a) of title 49, United States Code).

(2) ELIGIBILITY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), any entity that is eligible to receive assistance under the Clean Cities Program shall be eligible to receive a grant under this subsection.

(B) EXCEPTIONS.—

(i) CERTAIN OIL COMPANIES.—A large, vertically-integrated oil company shall not be eligible to receive a grant under this subsection.

(ii) PROHIBITION OF DUAL BENEFITS.—An entity that receives any other Federal funds for the construction or expansion of alternative refueling infrastructure shall not be eligible to receive a grant under this subsection for the construction or expansion of the same alternative refueling infrastructure.

(C) ENSURING COMPLIANCE.—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Energy shall promulgate regulations to ensure that, before receiving a grant under this subsection, an eligible entity meets applicable standards relating to the installation, construction, and expansion of infrastructure necessary to increase the availability to consumers of alternative fuels (as defined in section 32901(a) of title 49, United States Code).

(3) MAXIMUM AMOUNT.—

(A) GRANTS.—The amount of a grant provided under this subsection shall not exceed \$30,000.

(B) AMOUNT PER STATION.—An eligible entity shall receive not more than \$90,000 under this subsection for any station of the eligible entity during a fiscal year.

(4) USE OF FUNDS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—A grant provided under this subsection shall be used for the construction or expansion of alternative fueling infrastructure.

(B) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—Not more than 3 percent of the amount of a grant provided under this subsection shall be used for administrative expenses.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. A point of order is reserved.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I was hoping for an 11th hour reprieve on this issue. We had sent up the call and the white flag to try to get this worked out. Hopefully, maybe in the few minutes I will take to talk about this, you will be moved to tears and be ready to accept the amendment, my friend.

One of the things that we have talked about today, and this is an important issue, is how we move forward on alternative fuels. This bill is important. It outlines some pretty important steps for us to move forward. But this amendment gives us the opportunity to have a concrete action that we can take that will immediately allow us to impact.

You think about my generation: It was going to the moon. The generation after me was the E-economy. This generation is going to be alternative fuels and how they change the course of our consumption of fuel both in our homes and in our cars; how national security, by getting us away from foreign oil, is changed forever, and not soon enough; how it helps our economy, how it helps our environment. All of that is right now. It is not 10 years, it is not 15 years, it is right now.

We have set up a pretty good system for research and development. We now have great amounts of resources going to get us to alternative fuels. We also have a look at the production of it. How do we produce biomass? How do we produce ethanol? What is the next level of cellulosic ethanol?

Then the big problem is the distribution of it. That is the one thing that we are just having a difficult time getting over. It is the one hurdle for an exponential growth in our ability to move to alternative fuels. Be it hydrogen, be it ethanol, be it biomass, all of those things have infrastructure problems.

The one thing that we know we can do is expand the number of ethanol

pumps. We have to do it. It must happen. But there is a problem. If you are a small, independent gas station owner, you have to take a huge risk, \$30,000 to \$60,000 to put in an ethanol pump on an economy of scale that isn't there yet. So we have to kick-start it. This is our opportunity to double the number of ethanol pumps available across the country.

I know we are going to get into some wrangling about germaneness, and about this paragraph doesn't jive with that paragraph, and this committee hasn't had a chance to talk about it, but this committee has. This bill passed by voice vote last year.

Voice vote, we all agreed in a bipartisan way. It went through committee. It had its hearing and moved on to the Senate. Unfortunately, that is where we didn't move it forward. But this is our opportunity to get it done and get it done soon.

My friend from Massachusetts, Mr. DELAHUNT, talked about the urgency, about how fast we should go forward on this and how important it was that we get away from dependency on foreign oil; and what that means to our national security, our economic security, our environmental security. There are only 34 States where you can even get ethanol at a gas station.

Let us take this bold move now. If we are serious about moving forward, let's just swallow this one and say, this is the right thing to do. We have already had hearings. We have already voted on it in the House. Let's get this thing moving, so we can double the number of ethanol pumps and move forward for the safety and security of the next generation that will change the course of our economy here in the United States.

I ask my friends to reconsider their reservation, and I would urge the support of this amendment. I look forward to working with you on this and other issues in the future.

#### POINT OF ORDER

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, my friend is eloquent as usual, but he still has an amendment that is not germane, and I continue to pose my objection.

Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, the amendment concerns matters that are not within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Science and Technology.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to comment on the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Michigan for his amendment and his dedication to what I clearly believe is an important issue, deploying the necessary infrastructure to carry biofuels. However, I find it necessary to support the point of order that this amendment is nongermane because it is beyond the scope of this very narrow research bill and squarely within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Energy and Commerce because it uses the

CAFE program as a funding source and essentially is an expansion of the Clean Cities program that was created under legislation coming from that committee.

While it is complementary to what we are trying to accomplish today and a subject which is potentially worth exploring elsewhere in this Congress, this is not the proper forum for this amendment, and I would oppose it.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, this matter is clearly in the jurisdiction of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and if the gentleman would be willing to withdraw his amendment, I would say to him on behalf of the committee, we will be glad to work with him in the future.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I thank the gentleman. I look forward to working with you on the committee. I know you are a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee. I think we can all agree this is an important direction and I look forward to working together.

Mr. Chairman, I would move to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BURGESS

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BURGESS:

Page 5, after line 21, insert the following new section:

#### SEC. 7. ADDITIONAL ISSUES.

Research and development under this Act shall address issues with respect to increased volatile emissions or increased nitrogen oxide emissions.

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. A point of order is reserved.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, the amendment under section 7 should be the increased per gallon rate for biodiesel credit.

The CHAIRMAN. Would the gentleman please submit a copy of the amendment to the desk?

Mr. BURGESS. The amendment was submitted and should be at the desk, but we will bring a copy to the Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BURGESS:

Add at the end the following new section:  
**SECTION 7. INCREASE IN PER GALLON RATE FOR BIODIESEL CREDIT.**

(a) **INCOME TAX CREDIT.**—Paragraphs (1)(A) and (2)(A) of section 40A(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (defining biodiesel mixture credit and biodiesel credit) are both amended by striking "50 cents" and inserting "\$1.00".

(b) **EXCISE TAX CREDIT.**—Paragraph (2) of section 6426(c) of such Code (relating to biodiesel mixture credit) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) **APPLICABLE AMOUNT.**—The applicable amount is \$1.00."

(c) **CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.**—

(1) Section 40A(b) of such Code is amended by striking paragraph (3) and redesignating paragraphs (4) and (5) as paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively.

(2) Section 40A(d)(3)(C)(ii) of such Code is amended by striking "subsection (b)(5)(B)" and inserting "subsection (b)(4)(B)".

(3) Paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 40A(e) of such Code are both amended by striking "subsection (b)(5)(C)" and inserting "subsection (b)(4)(C)".

(4) Section 40A(f)(2) of such Code is amended to read as follows:

"(2) **EXCEPTION.**—Subsection(b)(4) shall not apply with respect to renewable diesel."

(d) **EFFECTIVE DATES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided by paragraph (2), the amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to fuel sold or used in taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) **EXCISE TAX.**—The amendment made by subsection (b) shall apply with respect to any sale, use, or removal after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Mr. BURGESS (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. A point of order is reserved.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, I won't spend a lot of time expanding on why we need to reduce our reliance on foreign energy. I think it has been well stated this morning. Most of us recognize, just looking at a picture of the leader of Venezuela, what the problem is.

We recognize when we see what is happening in Nigeria and other areas, the Middle East, what the situation is. And our energy position is not sustainable within the United States. So homegrown fuels, such as biodiesel, can help move the United States toward greater energy independence.

Mr. Chairman, as animal feed prices rise because of increased use of corn for ethanol, we need to examine ways to increase alternative fuels without reducing arable land use for farming.

Mr. Chairman, there is a small company back home in my district in Texas, Biodiesel Industries, and they have discovered how to make biodiesel from a variety of feedstock. Yes, they use the usual soybean and sunflower oils, but they also manufacture it from recycled restaurant grease, and we have got an abundance of recyclable restaurant grease in the DFW area.

Biodiesel Industries runs a Fry Oil to Fuel program which recycles used vegetable oils into biodiesel. Over 130 restaurants, schools, businesses and large kitchens in the metroplex have signed up to participate. Small restaurant owners typically have to pay for a grease collection or simply throw it away, but as part of the Fry Oil to Fuel program, both the recycling service

and the collection container are provided at no cost.

Large companies, on the other hand, often have contracts with animal feedlots, which could increase the risk of illnesses such as Bovine Spongiform Encephalosis and other animal neurologic diseases. If the grease goes into landfills, it creates methane, which we know is a potent greenhouse gas, much more potent than carbon dioxide. That landfill methane can be captured and used to create electricity, which is what Bioindustries does, but most often this methane is just simply vented into the atmosphere. If the grease goes into feedlots, it creates what we could politely refer to as bovine methane, again, a potent source of greenhouse gasses.

Putting that grease to work as part of our fuel supply helps to increase our energy supply here at home and could actually help to clean up our air.

This is not just happening in my district in north Texas. There are other facilities around the country doing this very same type of biodiesel protection.

The American Jobs Creation Act provided an agri-biodiesel tax credit of \$1 per gallon for biodiesel from virgin agricultural production, and 50 cents per gallon for biodiesel from recycled grease through 2006. The Energy Policy Act of 2005 extended these credits through 2008.

My amendment would simply double the tax rate for making biodiesel from recycled restaurant grease from 50 cents to \$1 a gallon, making it financially comparable to those from virgin agricultural sources. The text is identical to H.R. 6354, which I introduced at the close of the 109th Congress.

I believe this issue is of paramount importance. We must encourage our citizens and our entrepreneurs to think outside the box in reducing our reliance on foreign energy.

I want to thank my friend and colleague from the State of Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) for his support on this amendment, both in the Rules Committee yesterday as well as speaking so eloquently in support of the rule today.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to comment on my reserved point of order.

I would make the point that this amendment is not germane to the committee's substitute made in order under the rule. It would be more appropriate to have it in the Committee on Ways and Means, because there is a tax provision.

Again, the amendment concerns matters not within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Science and Technology.

I ask for a ruling of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

If not, the Chair is prepared to rule. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. LAMPSON) makes a point of order that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) is not germane.

The bill addresses research demonstration and development of certain fuels. Specifically, it addresses biofuel activities, sulfur content of diesel fuels and reference standards for biofuels. The bill was referred to and reported by the Committee on Science and Technology. The amendment seeks to increase a Federal income tax credit, a matter within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means.

□ 1315

One of the fundamental principles of germaneness is that the amendment must confine itself to matters within the jurisdiction of the committee with jurisdiction over the underlying bill. The bill is within the sole jurisdiction of the Committee on Science and Technology. The amendment contains matters within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means. The amendment is not germane. The point of order is sustained.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CANTOR

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CANTOR:

At the end of the bill, insert the following new section:

**SEC. 7. ADDITIONAL FINDING.**

The Congress also finds that in order to lessen United States dependence on foreign sources of petroleum, and decrease demand for petroleum in aircraft, such as passenger planes with 42 business class seats capable of transcontinental flights, the Nation must diversify its fuel supply for aircraft to include domestically produced alternative fuels.

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. A point of order is reserved.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. I reserve the right to object as well, Mr. Chairman. We have not seen a copy of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. A point of order is reserved.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Chairman, today's debate on H.R. 547 ultimately is about finding ways for our Nation to reduce its dependence on petro fuels. I offer this amendment, Mr. Chairman, one in response to an issue that has caught the attention of the American people and is being wildly reported in the press. The subject of this report in the amendment is the request by the office of the Speaker for the use of a luxury jetliner.

Today, the New York Post cleverly questioned the "Airogance," that is A-I-R, of a request to use a \$22,000-an-hour taxpayer-funded luxury jetliner to fly the Speaker from coast to coast.

While citing security concerns, a request was made by the Office of the Speaker for a plane that, according to the Air Force, has a game room, a stateroom, entertainment center, bedroom, shower, and seats 42 to 50 people.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I hardly think these amenities help with security, and I personally would describe them at the very least as inappropriate and an unnecessary extravagance.

Again, H.R. 547 is about finding ways to shift our Nation's patterns of fuel consumption. We hear a lot of talk about doing everything we can to achieve energy independence. And there is a lot of talk as well about stopping global warming. In this context, Mr. Chairman, these reports and the underlying request by the Office of the Speaker is an extravagance of power. It is something that, frankly, the taxpayers won't swallow. And I urge the passage of this amendment.

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to comment on my reserved point of order.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment is not germane to the committee substitute made in order under the rules. The amendment contains a different subject matter than the intent of H.R. 547.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman continuing to reserve his point of order?

Mr. LAMPSON. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is reserved.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to rise today in support of the amendment from the gentleman from Virginia. We are discussing a very important issue that faces all Americans today, and that is making America energy independent.

As part of that goal, as part of that goal we must have energy conservation. Everyday somebody comes to the floor and talks about energy conservation.

There is another aspect to making America energy independent, and that is the aspect of fiscal responsibility. We have a program here today, it may be a very worthy program, but it costs money. How do we pay for it? You cannot be energy independent and support programs represented by the underlying bill unless you have the fiscal responsibility to pay for them. And that is why, Mr. Chairman, recent actions of our Speaker are most curious.

According to CNN, the Speaker's office has now requested that the military provide her with a luxury jet that seats 42 business class seats according to CNN, a fully enclosed stateroom according to CNN, an entertainment center, a private bed, state-of-the-art communications system, and a crew of 16.

Mr. Chairman, if we are going to tell the American people that we are going to be energy independent, you have to lead by example. You have to have a culture that says, yes, we are going to do things to conserve energy.

Now, somebody has brought up the aspect of security. That is a legitimate issue. But how come our previous Speaker, according to CNN, used a smaller jet, consuming far less fuel, that seated 12, not 42, and didn't have the requested fully enclosed stateroom, entertainment center, private bed, state-of-the-art communications center, and a crew of 16? Again, Mr. Chairman, you have to lead by example.

I also noticed recently that our Speaker was critical of the President

when it came to the issue of global warming. She was quoted as saying in the Boston Globe: "The signs of global warming and its impact is overwhelming and unequivocal." And in criticizing the President she said: "It is not just about what he says; it is about what he does."

So now we have the Speaker telling us, number one, we are going to have a Congress that is fiscally responsible, and we have the Speaker telling us that we have to be concerned about global climate change and energy conservation. Let's look at the fiscal responsibility aspect of this.

According to the D.C. Examiner, now a flight from the Nation's Capital to her hometown of San Francisco is going to cost \$300,000. Now, any one of our constituents can go on line to Expedia.com and make the same trip for \$300. Okay, well, again, maybe there is some legitimate security concerns, but do we need the 42 business class seats, a fully enclosed stateroom, an entertainment center, private bed, state-of-the-art communications system, and a crew of 16? How is that leading by example? How is that an example of this Democratic Congress's commitment to fiscal responsibility and energy conservation? I don't think it is.

So why is the Speaker requesting this? Well, according to the Washington Times, it says that she is seeking regular military flights not only for herself and her staff, but also for relatives and for other members of the California delegation. That is according to the Washington Times.

According to CNN, just recently she asked the use of the military plane to attend a retreat in Williamsburg, Virginia, that is a 2-hour drive from Washington, D.C.

Now, this plane that she wants costs \$15,000 an hour. How many gallons of fuel is that consuming? How do we come forth to the American people and say let's pass a bill for energy conservation, and then we have this waste? I don't understand it, Mr. Chairman.

And now apparently there is a new wrinkle here. We understand from the San Francisco Chronicle that the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) when asked about this said, and referring to the Pentagon: "I don't need to pressure them. I just tell them what they need to do," in dealing with this request to the military for this luxury plane.

Apparently he was further quoted in CNN, ABC, and the San Francisco Chronicle that "the Pentagon made a mistake in leaking information," quote, "since she decides on the allocations for the Department of Defense."

This is not conservation. It is not fiscal responsibility. Let's support the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman from Texas continuing to reserve his point of order?

Mr. LAMPSON. I do not.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman withdraws his reservation.

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, one of the key principles of leadership is to lead by example, and the leader of this House, Speaker PELOSI, has moved us to restrict access to executive jets, as she should have. She has also moved to institute new spending controls for the Congress and for the government, as she should have. And she has moved to reduce our impact on the environment, especially man's effect on climate change, as she should.

I agree with each of these priorities. But the Speaker's staff request to upgrade her military domestic taxi service from a small plane that was offered to Speaker HASTERT for 12 passengers and a crew of five, to a major airliner with 45 passengers and a crew of 16 appears to be extravagant, appears to expand the Congress's excess to executive jets, appears to remove any spending controls from our operations, and dramatically increases our impact on the environment, especially climate change.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that a major airliner costing over \$10,000 an hour to fly is an extravagance that is beyond the Speaker's status as third in line to succeed the President under our plan in the Constitution and in procedure for the continuity of government.

In fact, the Department of Defense has ruled that since the Speaker has never become the President of the United States in the 220 years of our country's history, that the continuity of government plan does not include providing 24/7 military taxi service within the domestic United States, carrying family, other Members of Congress, staff, and supporters to both political and official events.

Now, we know that jetliners emit a large amount of greenhouse gases, and we know that this aircraft costs millions of dollars, and we know that the Congress has dramatically restricted the access of executive jets to everyone else, but the Speaker.

I might inject a point of common sense here that the Speaker's staff has said that, for security reasons, she must have unlimited access to an aircraft at the 89th Military Airlift Wing like this one.

And I may point out that in my experience of watching public officials move through airports, a figure like Senator OBAMA or Senator MCCAIN attracts a much larger crowd than one for the Speaker. I might think that if we have to offer a military taxi service to the Speaker, we would also have to offer one to the fourth in line for the Presidency, the President pro tempore of the Senate.

How much will this cost? How much in greenhouse gases will it emit? And last and not least, what sort of example does it send as a leader who is advocating all of these other policies that, in the operation of her own staff and her own offices, she is not following those principles?

For that reason, I urge the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. MCCHENRY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, our Speaker loves to fly and it shows. Today, we are debating a key provision in this important bill before us, the first open rule of the 110th Congress. We are glad that the majority could get around to it in the second month we are here.

But today it is important that we discuss a revolution in biofuels, an idea that we can look at ways to relieve the burden of global warming.

□ 1330

We know the Democratic majority is very focused on researching this idea of global warming, the idea that fossil fuels are warming the Earth and that the burning of fossil fuels are warming the Earth.

It is ironic that the highest officer of this body seeks a large jet to fly across country that could seat 42 people, perhaps some of the Speaker's friends and allies and supporters, some here in this body, some, oh, perhaps downtown, large contributors, I am not sure, although that has been denied by the Speaker in the request for those people to fly along, this plane, that are contributors and campaign supporters.

But let us talk today about a few important provisions. After the Speaker made a promise to the American people that they would be the most ethical Congress ever and after including the ban on the use of corporate jets in her lobbying reform bill, Speaker PELOSI asked for carte blanche access to one of the most extravagant and luxurious airliners in the military arsenal. It seats 42 people and has an office. It has a bedroom. Plenty of her cronies could fly along.

But the Speaker decided she, her family, her friends, her staff, her Democratic friends from California deserved to fly in style. This is not a matter of security, Mr. Chairman. It is a matter of, well, whatever is convenient for the Speaker as an individual.

But this is a bullet point to a larger value for this Democrat majority. It is about the Democrats' abuse of power since they have taken office just a short month ago, and it began when this Speaker denied minority rights to Republicans and continued with Tunagate which the Speaker, throwing a sop to her home constituents headquartered in her district, allowed American Samoa to be exempt from the minimum wage bill. Now they are seeking a matter of personal convenience and luxury.

Well, I believe the Speaker deserves security, not luxury; security, not convenience. As the New York Post reported today, the conventional view is that emissions of carbon dioxide, a greenhouse gas, are a major factor in global warming, and the jet PELOSI is demanding produces more than 10,000 pounds of carbon dioxide per hour, far more than the commuter plane the previous Speaker used.

If the Speaker is so concerned about global warming, maybe the Speaker should consider the same mode of transportation her colleagues took to the retreat this past weekend. They took a train.

It is very important that this House debate this important provision that the Speaker's request from the American military, and I think it is important that we discuss in terms of our research that we are trying to put forward on new fuels, new forms of transportation, new modes of powering our economy, and in terms of the global warming debate that is a large issue the American people are concerned about.

Let us talk about this luxury airliner and let us see what my Democrat colleagues say about the Speaker using it.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I rise in support of the Cantor amendment, and I thank the gentleman from Virginia for bringing this amendment.

As we look at the overall atmosphere that is here, and not just the atmosphere in this Congress, Mr. Chairman, but in the atmosphere up above and on this Earth, and we see the effort that is coming, this strong effort, to address global warming.

Now, I am not one of those strong proponents of those kinds of efforts; I want to make that clear. I do not think the science is there, but I do look at how this Congress has started, how it was going to be the most open Congress in history, and it has now been opened up today, and I appreciate that.

We understand the issue that had to do with minimum wage and the Tunagate issue, and now here we are a judgment issue, a judgment issue of the small plane that Speaker Hastert had was plenty big enough for a very big man and the entourage that he needed to provide his security, and yet now here we have a request for a plane that I see is 42 business class seats, 16 staff people that consumes \$300,000 for a round trip.

The statistics that I have are \$22,000 an hour, \$22,000 an hour. Mr. Chairman, that is more money than many of my constituent families make in a year. Well, let us just say that \$22,000 an hour is that amount. Then how many people, how many families does it take to earn enough to pay for a year of this plane flying back and forth from Washington to the west coast every single week? So I use 50 weeks, added the math up, its overall costs by those numbers is \$15 million annually for this big plane to bounce back and forth and to be able to load all of the family and the supporters, the staff, perhaps other Members, constituents, who knows who might be on that plane, \$15 million.

Now, how hard is it to pay \$15 million out of the Federal Treasury? Well, if we took all of the revenue of the income of those families that I reference, Mr. Chairman, those families at \$22,000

a year, it would take 682 families to earn enough revenue just to pay to fly the Speaker back and forth so she could be with her family on the weekends in San Francisco.

That lays out what is happening here in my mind, and I take us back to that place near enough to Hollywood that I can reference it. Many of the people in Hollywood that have been flying around on private jets and driving around in big SUVs have been called to task for their positions promoting an effort to stop global warming, but the hypocrisy of riding in those SUVs and flying in private jet planes. Now, the pressure has gotten great enough that I do not know that Hollywood has actually seen the conflict between their public position on policy and their actual practice when they climb in the SUV or get on their private jet.

But the public does know that Prince Charles of Great Britain has recognized the conflict, and he has been flying in private jets for years; but this year, he is taking the step that he is flying commercial, not because he is not a very intense individual that is a high-risk target.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KING of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I would invite the Speaker of the House down to this floor to answer these important questions. I think this would be something the body would appreciate. I think that would be a very helpful proposition, if the Speaker of this Chamber comes to the floor to answer these questions.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, and I thank the gentleman and my statement then would be, I also offer that same invitation.

I would say if it is good enough for Prince Charles, it should be good enough for the imperial Pelosi regime.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to rise in support of my colleague's amendment from Virginia on three points: conservation, fiscal responsibility, and example.

Those of us on our side of the aisle from time to time are criticized, perhaps correctly or incorrectly, on our lack of appreciation of conserving fuels when it comes to driving cars, buses, trains, airplanes. I have had amendments in the past that would seek to try to educate Americans how they can drive their own personal automobiles smarter, in ways to use less gasoline. Not only would that help them in the pocketbook but also help the environment.

This is a clear overreach from a standpoint of conservation because the jets available to the Speaker, she should make the most appropriate selection of that jet to accommodate not only her safety. Clearly, that is an important mission for this to be consid-

ered, but also take into consideration the operating characteristics of the airplanes that she wants to fly in.

So the selection of a 757, however it is configured, we have already paid for that configuring and somebody in the Air Force decided that they needed that particular configuration, and I am not questioning that, but the 757 itself is clearly too large an airplane to carry one person, the Speaker, to and from her district.

The fiscal responsibility stands on its face. It does not take a CPA to understand that an operating cost of \$22,000 per hour versus the operating cost of a G-5, which is in the \$5,000 range, that \$17,000 an hour differential is being paid for by somebody.

Well, in my mind, that somebody is a taxpayer in west Texas. That taxpayer is probably working morning tower on a Parker drilling rig or a Patterson UTI drilling rig, going to work at eleven o'clock at night working till seven o'clock the next morning, trying to pay his taxes, in addition to feeding his family and providing for them.

That is who I think is going to pay the \$17,000 when I look at the option of the \$5,000 G-5 versus the \$22,000 757.

The last point I want to make is that of example. All of us are in leadership positions. All 435 Members of this House are leaders in one small way or another. We lead our own offices, and we set the example of the way we conduct ourselves. If I conduct myself one way, my staff, in all likelihood, is going to mimic that. They are going to do what I do and hopefully maybe learn from my example. I think the same thing will happen here.

When the leader of this House, by her example, says money is no object, cost is no object, if for whatever we are trying to do, that is not a consideration to be considered when you look at decisions that have to be made.

Now cost does not drive every single decision; but where I grew up, most of the folks in District 11, that is one of the questions that gets asked whenever we are trying to make a decision, how much is that going to cost, because in our own mind we make a quick cost-benefit analysis between the benefits that we seek versus those costs. If we can get those benefits for a lower cost, then I can assure you most folks in District 11 will opt for the lower cost to get those same benefits.

So the benefits that we want is the Speaker being able to go to and from her district safely with the security folks that she needs to have on the plane. Beyond that I am not sure why we should be flying folks back and forth on this jet; but if there are empty seats in that smaller jet, I do not begrudge any of my Democrat colleagues from California wanting to ride back and forth. That is fine. As I make the stop in Dallas or Houston and wait for the next leg of my flight or I have missed that next leg of flight, I will not begrudge the fact that they are flying nonstop to San Francisco. That is fine.

So safety of the Speaker, clear, that has got to be done, but we also ought to do it in a cost-effective manner. So if she is leading from the top, with her tone from the top being that money is no object, whatever it takes to have something done that she wants done, that needs to be done, we are not going to consider costs, then I think that will percolate throughout her staff and the Democrat side of this institution, and the fiscal responsibility that they laid claim to throughout the campaign last year and they are trying to lay claim to in this Congress I think is called into question.

So I support my colleague's amendment and urge a vote "yes" in favor of it.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Cantor amendment. We all had campaigns this last November, and my opponent kept calling the 109th Congress the do-nothing Congress, and I want to officially name the 110th Congress as the smoke-and-mirror Congress.

We have consistently heard from the other side about the minimum wage and the average American. We have heard about global warming. In fact, I think the Speaker even testified today on global warming, and yet we see the abuse of power that is going on here in the fact that we have not been through regular order on a lot of the bills that have passed here, especially in the first 100-hour program.

We were going to have a 5-day work week which I am not sure that we have had one yet. We are going to be productive in the fact that we are flying up here and all Members, all 435 Members in this body have to fly back up here on Mondays to vote on naming a post office or wishing somebody a happy birthday, rather than being at home with our constituents and our families.

Now, I have learned something else today or over the last couple of days that evidently the 757 is the smallest aircraft we have that can haul one person. It seems to be that the military would have some sort of other plane that could haul one person to California that would be more fuel efficient, take less than a 16-person crew and cost less than \$22,000 an hour.

I am very fortunate in I live in Georgia and I live about 45 minutes from the world's busiest airport in Atlanta, and so I can actually leave Reagan and get home in about a 3-hour period of time. I am very fortunate.

But I have flown home with many Members, my fellow Members in this House, some of them are going to Atlanta to fly on to Oklahoma or on to Texas, even had one colleague that was going on to California, having to stop in Atlanta. We are not all fortunate to have nonstop flights to our district.

I fly many times with Mr. MILLER from Florida or Mr. ROSS from Arkansas or others that have to make stops and have to make transfers of planes, that have to sit in middle seats.

□ 1345

We don't get to eat chocolate. We can have our choice of some crackers or peanuts. We don't have a crew of 16 at our disposal.

So as we sit in those middle seats because of the last-minute time that we have to catch a flight, many of us might think that, you know, we need someone to lead us by example. So I would call on the Speaker to lead by example, to put some meaning into the things that I have heard being said from the other side of the House.

You know, I keep hearing the word "bipartisan," I see people's lips moving. I hear these words coming out of their mouths. I just haven't seen any action on it.

I keep hearing the word "conservation." I hear the word, I see the lips moving, but I don't know if this is a good example of being a conservationist with our fuel and with our air quality.

I keep hearing "being compassionate," haven't seen it. So there are a lot of things that I think can be done by a leader by setting an example.

Mr. Chairman, in closing, I would just like to ask that somebody step up to the plate and lead by example.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The gentleman from Georgia has been talking about examples. Well, let me give you an example, we just heard about whining, whining about chocolate and whining about tobacco. Here we are trying to give you an example about leading, about doing something about this country's very, very, very major problem with global warming and with alternative energy and energy dependency.

Let me tell you what, I have just been through 3 hours of a hearing, 3 hours, where representatives of the IPCC, which represents 113 nations including the United States, came before us and said after 5 years of study, 30,000 comments, 600 scientists; they made a recommendation, and that recommendation was that with 100 percent certainty, there is global warming, and with 90 percent certainty, human action is making it worse.

Today, our example is trying to do something about that. Today, we have the first bill on this floor to deal with alternative energy, to deal with making our Nation energy independent. So this is an example of us trying to move forward.

It is a bipartisan bill, and I might remind the gentleman that when, after 9/11, when Speaker HASTERT was the first to be given transportation for security reasons, I don't think anybody over there complained. I don't think anybody over here complained.

When the President of the United States, George Bush, said that it is a matter of security, we didn't hear anybody complain; when the Department of Defense has also given a ruling on this, that again what is available will

be available for the person who is the second-ranking person to be President of the United States.

Now, if Speaker PELOSI is going to be attacked here on this floor for eating chocolate or anything else, you can imagine what more serious people might be doing. So, yes, this is an example today. We have an example of, if we want to, on a bipartisan basis do something about global warming.

Let me tell you, we talk about 10 years from now, maybe. Or is it 20 years? Sometimes you can say, well, to have a serious problem with global warming, it might be 30 years or 50 years. Well, that is not hypothetical. I have a 5-year-old daughter. Some of you probably have young children or young grandchildren. If any of them were born in this century, in all likelihood, they are going to live till the end of this century. They are going to inherit a much different world.

So this is real. So I think now the time is to lead by example. Let us do something about this. We have a good bill on the floor. This is our example. You can have whatever example you want.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I rise to support the amendment of the gentleman from Virginia. I do rise on the point of conservation and pointing out some conservation. You know, it is amazing to me to hear all of this talk that we have about global warming. But you know what, the debate that we are having here just points out, Mr. Chairman, there is a difference between conservationists and environmentalists, and this is one of the debates that points this out. Conservationists walk the walk. Environmentalists talk about it, but they do not walk the walk.

You know, I remember, I appreciate so much the gentleman from Tennessee's comments about global warming and the threat that is there. Well, you know what? I am old enough to remember having been in high school in the 1960s, and I remember in the early 1970s, going into college where we were all going to freeze to death.

We were going to freeze to death. It was on the cover of every magazine out there. We had an Ice Age that was coming. I was scared to death. I thought, my goodness, I will never be able to have children, watch them grow up, because we are going to be living in igloos.

Well, but you know what? It did not happen, and now we find out, guess what, 100 years ago, they thought they had a warming cycle; or they did, they documented it. Then we find out that the rises and falls in temperatures of this great Earth are cyclical. It is there, and, yes, it is rising a little bit right there. But in 1969 and 1970 and 1971, the Ice Age was coming, and there was scientific proof.

You know, at Energy and Commerce Committee last year, we had some great hearings. We talked about the

fallacy of the hockey stick theory. We discussed that. We heard testimony, and we can have all of our community of scientists who are trying to serve the purpose of validating one another's theories, but not wanting to go back and use the evidence from 100 years ago, and it just proves the point, as is often said on this floor, you are entitled to your opinion, but you are not entitled to a different set of facts, and that is the truth.

You know, it is of tremendous concern, on a day when we are talking about the environment, that we do have an example being brought forth that would be spending, not only \$22,000 an hour, but would be spending a lot in emissions, in gases. This is something that does deserve to be discussed, Mr. Chairman.

I tell you what, we have named this, we have talked about this being the hold-on-to-your-wallet Congress, and for every hour that our friends across the aisle are in charge, they are racking up, not thousands and millions, but moving to billions. Hold on to your wallet because of what they are choosing to spend the taxpayers' hard-earned money on.

It is of great concern to me, when I read reports that are coming out of all sorts of papers and news organizations about how this is coming to be, people returning to smoke-filled rooms, picking up the phones, calling, saying, this is the way it ought to be done.

Mr. Chairman, it is of great concern to me, I think for those of us who are conservationists, who want to be certain that we leave this Earth a better place than we found it. We are wise to stand and to question the bill and to support the amendment of the gentleman from Virginia.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to identify a little bit with my colleague from Georgia who was here talking about this being the smoke-and-mirrors Congress. There are so many things being talked about that aren't true. Today, I was speaking with one of my constituents at home from Wilkes County, Angela Henley. The issue of airplanes came up, and she said to me, you know, I think the officials should adopt the principle to lead by example and not by extravagance. I said, you know, these are the kinds of things, this is the reason we ought to be going home more instead of spending all this time we are spending in Washington.

The majority party wants people to believe that you have got to be in Washington, because that is where all the wisdom of the world is. But I think it is this Beltway mentality that gets us in trouble all the time, and gets people to thinking that we as Members of Congress are here to be served, not to serve.

I said here this morning in opening remarks that I am very troubled by this whole affair. I came here to serve the people of the Fifth District of

North Carolina. I don't think that we are supposed to be treated like kings and queens.

We came here to do the work of the people. It is called the people's House, and I think it is very important that we do that.

What is happening is, the mentality of the majority party is that all the wisdom of the world is in Washington, D.C., the only work that gets done is in Washington, D.C. We should be here 5 days a week, not be in our district with the average American citizen.

Well, you lose track of what the average American citizen is dealing with. That is why I thought Angela Henley's comments were so brilliant today when I talked to her.

Again, elected officials should adopt the principle to lead by example and not by extravagance. That is the message that needs to be sent. That is not the message that is being sent by the majority party and by the Speaker in her example.

What we need to be doing is we need to make sure we are doing what is right by the American people and not putting additional burdens on them by adding costs.

The other thing I want to mention is, there has been a lot made about the fact that the Department of Defense has approved this. This was a headline in yesterday's paper saying the appropriators are going to get out of the departments what they want by twisting the arms of the various departments and agencies. And we all know that there is a close relationship between some of the appropriators and the Speaker, and I have no doubt that the appropriators are going to get from the departments what it is they want from them, to justify anything at all that they want to justify whether it is extravagant or not.

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Interesting, Mr. Chairman, the report of this amendment has reached the White House. I would like to report to you the official statement from the White House just given by Tony Snow.

Quoting Mr. Snow, "This is a silly story. I think it's been unfair to the Speaker. What happened in the wake of September 11 is the Department of Defense in order to protect the Speaker began offering aircraft to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, did it with Representative Hastert, doing so with Speaker Pelosi."

"We think it's important that the Speaker of the House enjoy the same kind of security that we arranged for Speaker Hastert in the wake of September 11. And like I said, I think that there's been a lot of overhyped reporting on this."

I certainly concur with Mr. Snow. This is a silly story. We have a chance to get on to serious business. To put this to rest, as the author of this bill, and as the chairman of the Science

Committee from which it came, we want to accept this amendment and allow this country then to get on to the serious business of trying to do something about alternative fuels.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. MCHENRY. Thank you so much, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

The question is, if we want to combat global warming, why should we, as an institution, allow one person to use a 737 for a \$300,000 transcontinental flight? That is the question I pose to the Science Committee, Mr. Chairman.

□ 1400

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I reclaim my time and give it to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Thank you for that commentary, and I think the White House has given you the answer. If you would like for me to read it to you again. As I heard BARNEY FRANK say here one time, I can read it to you, but I can't understand it for you. But I would be happy to read it to you again:

"This is a silly story, and I think it's been unfair to the Speaker. What happened in the wake of September 11 is that the Department of Defense, in order to protect the Speaker, began offering aircraft to the Speaker of the House of Representatives; did it with Representative Hastert, doing so with Speaker Pelosi. We think it's important that the Speaker of the House enjoy the same kind of security that we arranged for Speaker Hastert in the wake of September 11. And, like I said, there has been a lot of overhype in reporting this story."

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I appreciate the gentleman mentioning me. I just want to explain, I hadn't really expected to be here, but as I was walking by, I thought I heard someone yelling, The plane, boss, the plane, and I wanted to come in and see what was happening.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The gentleman from Massachusetts is really one of my heroes on the floor, and I really appreciate and respect his sense of humor.

With that, the silliness in this that I see is the silliness when about a year ago, during the height of the energy crunch, a member of the Kennedy clan, who was not a Member of Congress, flew to New York on his private jet to talk about conservation of energy and global warming. It reminds me of the silliness of those who ride in limousines to and from their dinner engagements while whining about mothers using SUVs to drive. That is the type of silliness that I see in this debate. It isn't just about having a plane for security, it is the opulence of the plane that is at discussion.

But I have got to tell you, I see something deeper in this than the type of plane, and that is comments published in the San Francisco Chronicle, made by the subcommittee chairman of Appropriations on Defense such as: "Don't need to put pressure on them, just tell them what they need to do." This gentleman is the one that has been bidding for our Speaker on what type of plane.

Then when this became a story, mentioned also, I guess, with some sort of pride that was also quoted in many newspapers, CNN, San Francisco Chronicle, reminding the Defense Department that it is them that will make the decisions on appropriations, leaving the insinuation that if the correct plane is not given to the Speaker, that they will cut the Defense Department.

Now, I see the gentleman from Pennsylvania is in our Chamber, and I would yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania to explain which part of the defense budget he intends to cut or not appropriate if she does not get this specific plane that she wants.

I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will direct his comments to the Chair.

Mr. TERRY. I am sorry. I yielded to the gentleman from Pennsylvania. My remarks are to the Chair. I am yielding to the gentleman from Pennsylvania to answer the colloquy that I put forward to him.

I see the gentleman is not moving.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, isn't it customary that after a minority speaker speaks, then you go to the majority side?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair did not see the gentleman.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Members, I have sat in my office and got caught up on a lot of work and I was listening to the debate, and I guess I am concerned about the tenor of the debate because I am serving in this Congress and I am in my eighth term, one term in the majority, the last 12 years in the minority, and I have never seen a display of what we are seeing on the floor today.

Because I served with Speaker HASTERT and many speakers, and it is frustrating to see this activity. My concern is what we are portraying to the American people. And I think the chairman of the Science Committee pointed out the White House statement on the use of the plane.

I was here on the floor after 9/11, and I know that not one Member on the Democratic side questioned whether Speaker HASTERT needed the security, needed a nonstop to his district. And I think that is far beyond anything we should be considering.

I want to save energy, although I have to admit, I have a district where

we produce a lot, and I am glad people use it. But I also know that we have more important things in this House to do than to pick at one person who happens to be the Speaker of the House. I could go back and find lots of things from former Speakers of the minority party and talk about it, but again, we didn't do that. I didn't, and I don't remember any of my colleagues doing it. But I also know that if we are going to seriously be legislators, then we need to pass this bill.

I was concerned with some of the amendments that were brought up earlier literally by members of my Energy and Commerce Committee that were not germane because their amendments would have been germane if this had been an Energy and Commerce bill, but it is not. It is a Science bill. That is why I think if we are serious about dealing with global warming, more efficiency in fuel, there are lots of ways we can do it. I know the Science Committee is doing their job, and I know the Energy and Commerce Committee will; and if there are tax issues that need to be dealt with, I know the Ways and Means Committee will deal with it.

Mr. Chairman and Members, I would hope we would realize that the actions today do not reflect good on the House itself.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR) to H.R. 547. I also rise to support H.R. 547, Advanced Fuels Infrastructure Research and Development Act. It is a good bill. And I am on the Science Committee, and it did pass by unanimous consent.

Mr. Chairman, I was also at the hearing this morning that lasted 3 hours on the Science Committee with my chairman, the gentleman from Tennessee. And we were honored to have the Speaker of the House of Representatives testify before that committee. Well, this is a historic opportunity. She was received with a great deal of respect and certainly respect by me.

She testified; I don't disagree with any of her testimony. She talked about global warming and the concern that she has for our young children and the environmental debt that has to be paid at some point in the future. Unfortunately, her schedule did not permit time to take questions, maybe a couple, from the Members of the Science Committee. Maybe one question that should have been asked if we had that opportunity is how about the economic debt that we would have to pay if we do something draconian when all these other countries, especially countries like China and India, are totally ignoring it, and they are going to continue to pollute the environment.

This amendment, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman from Virginia brings is about the concern with continuing to produce carbon dioxide, and yes, polluting the environment, and jet fuel is a big problem, a big contributor to

that. I commend the chairman for accepting the amendment, and I think we should do that unanimously. Maybe the Speaker would like to come down on the floor and take as much time as she would like and talk about her support for this. But the Speaker has made a mistake in requesting a jet plane far beyond what the previous Speaker had.

I don't disagree that she should have the same security as the previous Speaker; we are not arguing that point. Mistakes can be made like Tunagate; the Speaker may not have known about that. And she was smart enough to call a press conference and say we are going to correct that, she should be smart enough to hold a press conference and correct this.

Mr. WEINER. I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this can't possibly be the best they have got. This can't be. I cannot imagine that a party that governed for the last 12-some-odd years, who had a Congress that met less days than the do-nothing Congress, who wasted billions of dollars in the Iraq war doing no oversight, drove up the deficit to record heights, wasted homeland security funds, it can't possibly be that the best that party has is to now devote an afternoon talking about the security arrangements for the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives.

Well, let's talk a little bit about what we have. Putting aside for a moment, which apparently is what the other side wants, putting aside for a moment the bill we are here to debate, which is a way to improve energy programs with existing infrastructure, and I can guarantee my colleagues will be lining up to take advantage of that program, we have, in the first 100 hours of this Congress, raised the minimum wage; we have lowered the cost of people to send their children to college; we have implemented the 9/11 Commission Report. We have moved through an agenda with efficiency to get things done for the American people, and now my colleagues on the other side want to have an argument with the White House over the appropriate arrangements for the Speaker.

Now, look, I am sure that my good friends on the other side are so detached from reality that they think this is what the American people want to work on. This is a party that squandered the leadership that they had. Now the Republic Party is in the minority for the foreseeable future. The Republic Party is so completely bankrupt of any ideas of their own, they have taken to bringing up 3 hours of discussion and a debate between the White House and themselves about what kind of security the Speaker should have.

The Republic Party is the minority party not only for this reason, but this is one of them. And then to make it worse, the Members that the Republic Party sends over can't possibly be the

A team. This can't be the best. This can't be the most articulate, most informed voices of the Republic Party, can it? This is it.

I was in my office and I heard a Member of the Republic Party, and you will correct me, Mr. Chairman, if I am wrong, complaining that he had to sit in a middle seat. No, not a middle seat. Complaining that he had to eat peanuts on his flight. I don't even know what this is about.

Let me tell you what the American people are interested in. They are interested in the idea that, like Damocles' sword, global warming is now hanging over the head of all of us, all of us, Republican or Democratic, even the Republic Party must be concerned about that. We have had thousands of scientists that have reached a consensus—

Mr. MCHENRY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEINER. I will certainly be glad to yield.

Mr. MCHENRY. I thank the Congressman from New York for yielding, but don't you think a jet that is a 757 and can seat 42 people, flying one person is contributing to global warming?

Mr. WEINER. Reclaiming my time, even those members of this panel, these scientists that took a look at global warming, global climate change, 90 percent of them, a record level of consensus, say that human causes are to blame.

We are not going to leave it to the Republic Party to solve this problem. They are in the minority. They are probably in the permanent minority if they are going to spend their time obsessing about security arrangements for the Speaker and disagreeing with the President of the United States' spokesman. But we are. NANCY PELOSI, this party is going to do something about global warming; we are not going to wait for the Republic Party to join in. Just the same way we said we were going to increase the minimum wage, the same way we said we were going to increase safety by implementing the 9/11 Commission Report, the same way we said we were going to reduce college costs for the American middle class and those striving to make it, that is what we are going to do.

You can have this debate all you want about the security arrangements for the Speaker, but we are going to go about doing the job of the American people. That is why the Democratic Party is in charge, not the Republic Party.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

It is always interesting hearing from my friend from New York.

You know, we are about solutions, we try to be about solutions; that is what this body ought to be about. And I would humbly submit that if we were to set up windmills surrounding the Capitol, I believe there is enough hot air that comes out of this place that we could offset all the losses of energy

from an extravagant plane that flies from here to California with lots of passengers and a gym or whatever all it has got on there; but I would actually like to talk about the bill that the amendment is addressing and come back to the amendment for a moment.

□ 1415

But I come from a district there in east Texas that is blessed with an abundance of natural resources. And not only do we have oil and gas, we have got coal, and we have some something that is so often overlooked called biomass. Some folks don't know what that is, but it can take all kinds of forms, and one of those forms is the pine tree. You cut down the pine tree, you take the center of it, use it for paper, pulp, plywood, all of these other things. And then there is all this waste that can generate energy.

But the use of biomass is a source of energy, it is necessary for domestic industry purposes and actually is being used in our timber and paper industries to defray rapidly increasing overhead costs.

Presently, the uncertainty of energy supplies and prices make it impossible for domestic industry to efficiently forecast operating costs or make credible plans for future capital expenditures. For example, the forest products industry is partially self-sufficient because they use some of the biomass to provide energy to produce what they do. The biomass fuels can include bark, scrap wood, wood residuals, wood extractives from the pulping process.

So necessary to maintain a manufacturing base in this country that will sustain a driving economy is the energy produced by biomass, and I think that can play a vital role.

It is not enough simply to have a source of energy. It is also necessary to have a means to deliver it. So we have also got to improve our ability to deliver a wide array of energy resources to consumers by addressing the infrastructures. This bill doesn't really address any of those. It is kind of a feel-good bill. Anything can help a little bit.

But in conclusion, I just submit, look, if we all pitch in a little bit, districts like mine that have energy, if you allow us to use CO<sub>2</sub>, maybe pump it in the ground, get the last bit of oil up, use biomass, convert it into energy, if we keep doing those sorts of things using alternative energy, I think eventually we can pay for all the waste and extravagance that we are already seeing coming from the Speaker's request.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I rise to support this amendment. However, I will admit that it is rather more symbolic than substantive. And earlier this morning, Speaker PELOSI spoke before the Science Committee, as we have been reminded here during this debate. And during that testimony she declared her commitment to combat global warming. And that is a high priority.

Well, it is not then irrelevant for Members of Congress to call into question the seriousness of such public proclamations when personal choices are so extravagantly contradictory to those proclamations.

I am sorry. Speaker PELOSI, by commandeering a huge government plane for her personal transport to California, this is totally contradictory to the alarm bells that we heard her ringing in the Science Committee just a few hours ago.

And just for one, let me note that I certainly appreciate that Speaker PELOSI came to speak to us. And I certainly respect BART GORDON and the job that he did in putting together a very fine panel of witnesses for us. But I am personally a skeptic about global warming.

And let me just note that what we have here, after listening to the witnesses today, is the clear evidence that global warming and cooling have taken place in cycles throughout the history of the world. Right now, we are being told that this particular cycle is caused by human beings and how dangerous that is.

Well, let me note that even the witnesses today, the very witness that was showing how we can prove the Earth is warming on the chart, started his chart in 1850, which happened to be, by his own admission, the very end of a cooling period that had been going on for 500 years. So you start at the very low point and then you go to today and claim, oh, it is getting warmer. So what? You started at a low point.

Now, there is consensus that there is some warming going on, 1 degree over the last 30 years, supposedly. In reality, it is 1 degree over 100 years. And, yes, this is happening, but is it caused by human action? Even after hearing the witnesses today, I can't tell you that I don't believe, I still do not believe this is caused by human activity.

Now, why is this so important that we discuss this? Why is it important that we reject this alarmism? Because we are all now committed to an energy-independent America, and we are going to have to focus our energies and resources on developing new alternative sources of energy and technology that will make us independent of foreign oil.

And if we are alarmed by global warming and we are stampeded into focusing our efforts on something that is going to change a climate trend, instead of, for example, focusing on energy that will help clean the air at the same time, while making us independent, we are going to be making some bad decisions.

And who will be impacted by those decisions if we are stampeded by all of this alarmism about global warming? The people who will be better off are the researchers who have been getting grants by the billions of dollars over these years in order to claim that there is global warming. And I might add, there is plenty of evidence that researchers who are opposed to the global

warming theory have been cut off from research grants.

But who will be worse off? My children will be worse off. Your children and grandchildren will be worse off because we have not developed the technology aimed at cleaning the air and making us energy independent. Rather, we will have been stampeded into spending more money on useless research and money aimed at changing the climate trend of the planet, rather than on the health of the people of this planet. It makes no sense whatsoever.

If we are committed to energy independence, let's be serious about it. Conservation is part of the answer. And if Speaker PELOSI is serious, she should be serving as an example and not be doing things like commandeering a huge aircraft, which is enormously wasteful, to take her all the way to California.

And although this is symbolic, I think there is some substance here that does deserve to be commented on, so I am supporting this amendment.

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last comment.

Mr. Chairman, I am deeply concerned by what I am hearing on the opposite side. And I understand fully the frustration of the American people, having listened to the leadership of this party for so many years distracting Americans from the real issues confronting us. And to hear them attack NANCY PELOSI, the Speaker of the House for using a private airplane to take her back and forth to California, and of that size, is just outrageous.

The truth of the matter is that this is the party that completely blocked the 9/11 recommendations that were so critical to the security of this Nation. This is the party that refused to make sure that all the cargo inside the belly of airplanes is inspected. And now, when we have the Speaker of the House, who is rightly concerned about security, using a plane to protect her, and it is absolutely critical that we have this, now they are standing up to speak about this.

I am also deeply concerned about the claim that we are not being effective on global warming, because the American people understand this. They have seen the data. They understand it. They want us to move forward in a bipartisan manner. And they want us to stop bickering.

And so I plead to all of us to stop the bickering. Let's move on with the legislation.

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentlelady from New Hampshire for yielding because she of all people understands, coming from New Hampshire, that these issues of global climate change are not something that we can simply choose to do, what the other side is saying, which is ignore them for generations more and just hope for the best.

You were elected, and you came to this House saying that we are going to start getting things done. You said that we are going to reject the frivolous politics of the other side. We are not going to spend our time arguing over what the correct security protocols for the Speaker are going to be. We are going to focus on things that the American people really care about.

And I just want to ask you, has anyone stopped you on the streets in New Hampshire and asked you, expressed concern about global climate change?

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. People in New Hampshire are deeply concerned; both parties, by the way, are deeply concerned about global warming. And they want us to get on with the job of taking care of this and not spending our time and the people's time. And we are on the payroll of the American people, arguing and quibbling about such minor issues as the airplane.

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman further yield?

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WEINER. I thank the gentlelady.

And I would also say that I am sure that we are all very concerned about the security arrangements for the Speaker; and I think we would all agree, we want to do whatever is necessary, the same way none of us had any concerns when Speaker HASTERT got the protection.

But frankly, there are people that are working on that right now, and I think, and maybe you do as well; I will ask you. Do you agree with the statement of the White House that this is a silly issue that people are making too much of and that we should get back to the job of the country?

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Reclaiming my time, yes. I absolutely agree that this is wasting our time. We are earning our paycheck from the American people, and we need to do the work of the American people.

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman further yield?

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WEINER. I really do want to express my gratitude. The people of New Hampshire are very fortunate to have someone that came to Congress like you did. In your first 43 hours, you voted to raise the minimum wage, something that hadn't been done for years of neglect. You voted to make it less expensive for parents of New Hampshire to send their kids to school. You voted for a responsible continuing resolution that increased spending to put cops on the beat in New Hampshire.

You have, frankly, in your first several weeks here in the House, done more than your predecessors did for years and years because they were focused on issues like this on the other side. And I want to thank you for your service.

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Reclaiming my time, I thank you and we intend to

continue to deliver to the American people what they have asked us to do.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House, and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of the proceedings, or audible conversation, is in violation of the rules of the House.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I am not going to take much time. I am very concerned about the fiscal responsibility that we should have. And I know my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have spent a lot of time defending the \$300,000 per trip that the Speaker is going to be spending flying back and forth to California. But I don't think the American people are going to understand how \$15 million a year is being spent for one person to fly back and forth to California.

The Speaker is a very important person. She is third in line to the presidency, but there are other ways to get out there that cost less. I think the plane the former Speaker used would cost about one-fifth or one-fourth of that.

And I don't think, no matter what the other side says, that the American people are going to buy \$1.2 million a trip for her to go to California or \$15 million a year for her to go back and forth to her district. It just won't wash, especially at a time like this when we are trying to get spending under control.

Mr. Chairman, I will be happy to yield to my friend from Arizona.

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that this is one of those debates where you are sitting in your office and you are watching what has happened and you have no intention of coming down, and then you hear something said and you feel it is important to talk about that issue. That is how this strikes me, and I think it is important to set the record straight on some important points.

I don't think anybody on this side of the aisle challenges the importance of protecting the Speaker of the House and ensuring that she is secure. Indeed, that is a very important point to all people in the Nation. But that is not what this discussion is about.

I believe this discussion is about whether or not we are being asked to waste money, whether we are being asked, as has been articulated, to spend an extravagant amount of money, not to fly the Speaker and a few staff members, but to fly the Speaker and lots of staff members, plus family, plus other Members and who knows who. I think that is a legitimate issue to discuss here on the floor and an appropriate issue to discuss here on the floor.

One of the things that troubles me in this debate is that people say, well, we shouldn't be discussing this. I would like to invite my colleagues to think about the context in which this debate occurs. I would suggest that it is important to understand that when the

majority takes office and brings the first six bills to the floor under what is called a marshall law or some provision that says no amendments will be offered, and that is what happened here, you brought this under a rule or a provision that said we could offer no amendments to the minimum wage bill. Can't discuss it. Can't propose an alternate idea.

You then brought the 9/11 recommendations bill to the floor. No amendments. Not allowed. Can't discuss it. Can't offer your own ideas. At that point, in fact, you didn't even have a functioning Rules Committee.

□ 1430

You proceeded to bring many other important bills to the floor. The gentlewoman said that Republicans, in her view, didn't address the important issues, and yet your first six bills including minimum wage, stem cell, the 9/11 recommendations, student loans, energy, and Medicare prescription drugs, you bring to the floor, and you do not allow a single amendment by Republicans. And then you say, well, as soon as the 6 for '06 is over, we will allow amendments. We will go back to regular order.

But, in fact, that didn't turn out to be true. The seventh bill was the page board. Then the Pension Act, a very important bill that I thought was important for the Nation to pass, no amendments. Then the delegate bill. Finally, we get to bill nine, and you allow one amendment on that bill.

Then you come to the CR omnibus bill. On the CR omnibus bill that runs this government for the balance of the year and spends billions of dollars, how many amendments were the minority allowed? Absolutely none. And now you find it odd that we would want to engage in this debate right now.

As long as the rights of the minority are repressed by the majority so that we cannot do our job and represent the people of our district then you can expect this kind of exchange to occur on the floor.

And for my colleague from Texas who came to the floor and said he was disappointed in the level of debate, I would suggest that you look within yourself. If you repress debate, if you do not allow us to speak and address our issues, then we are going to use whatever tools we can.

I want to address another point that has been raised on the other side, and that is that the White House has said that it doesn't view this issue as all that significant or views it as "silly." Well, with all due respect to the White House, I respect Tony Snow and the White House's position on the issue; but, quite frankly, Tony Snow does not hold an election certificate and Tony Snow doesn't represent the taxpayers of Arizona. He does not have a duty, as I do, to come to this floor and to discuss the consequences for our taxpayers.

It seems to me that next week we are going to debate an issue of great importance to this Nation.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHADEGG. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, this debate has gone on for a long time and my colleague is very eloquent in what he says.

Let me just say that I hope that Speaker PELOSI will take the time to come down and explain to the full House the reason why she thinks she should have \$15 million a year to fly back and forth to California. I think she could be very eloquent in explaining why the taxpayers should spend that much money, and I would like to hear what she has to say.

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that it is important to understand the context in which each of these debates occur.

I agree with my colleagues on other side of the aisle who would say that this debate is not the central debate in America today, whether or not we spend an excessive amount of money to accommodate one Member of the Congress who ought to be protected. That is not exactly the most momentous moment or issue before the Nation right now.

But next week we will debate the war in Iraq. Next week we will debate the confrontation of this Nation with global terrorism. Next week we will debate the jihadis and their desire to destroy America and the importance of that fight.

Now, here is my concern: you on the other side of the aisle are concerned that we are making a big deal out of this issue. I would like to know if somebody on the other side of the aisle will promise me that next week you will have an open rule on the Iraq debate so that we can have a full discussion of all of the issues, because I welcome that debate. But what I fear, what I fear deeply is that we will not have an open rule next week. We will not have a reasonable opportunity to debate all of the alternatives.

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHADEGG. If you will answer the question of whether or not there will be an open rule next week, I would be happy to yield.

Mr. WEINER. Certainly.

Mr. SHADEGG. Will the gentleman vote for an open rule?

Mr. WEINER. Well, I have got to tell you something. I don't recall there being an open rule when we had the original vote on the war; do you, sir?

Mr. SHADEGG. All I know is we have been here so far almost 1½ months and we have been allowed, in 1½ months, one amendment. And it seems to me that you are frustrated with this debate and you want us to be discussing more important issues. It seems to me we ought to be discussing issues like

the importance of the war against global terror.

Mr. WEINER. Will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. SHADEGG. I would be happy to yield.

Mr. WEINER. I recall we were given an up-or-down vote without any opportunity for alternatives on the original war in Iraq, and I think we are going to have eight votes, and we have accepted this amendment, eight votes on various amendments to this bill. I think the lady doth protest too much.

Mr. SHADEGG. Will the gentleman answer the question I asked, though? Will there be an open rule in the debate on Iraq next week?

Mr. WEINER. I don't have any control over that. I think the gentleman is in scant position to protest when he himself was part of the leadership that said we couldn't have an open rule when we originally voted on this thing.

Mr. SHADEGG. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that in the Contract with America we offered to the minority 154 amendments. We had a functioning Rules Committee. Every bill in the Contract with America went through the standing committee process. Every bill went to the Rules Committee. The minority was entitled to bring amendments to, I think, all but two of those bills. This was our first effort. This was our first initiative to claim the attention of the American people.

We allowed the minority at that time to offer 154 amendments. And in that period, 48 of the minority's amendments were accepted. Now we have been here almost 1½ months, and we are being allowed the ability to amend only those bills on which there is no controversy.

I agree with the minority: the Speaker of the House should be protected. I agree with the minority that whether she is protected or not is an important issue for this Congress. But I do not agree that the minority isn't entitled to debate the expenditure of public funds, as we are doing here. I do not agree that this is an issue where, if the White House says it is a silly issue, we are not supposed to raise it. If that is the rule in this House, then I think there are a lot of things the White House is saying that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are challenging.

And it seems to me that if you are unhappy with this debate, then you need to look at the context in which this debate occurs. And I would suggest to you that next week when we begin a debate on the war in Iraq and a debate on the war against the jihadis who threaten our lives in America, who threaten world security, I only hope, I dearly hope, that you will give us an open rule or a rule that allows each of the alternatives to be debated, because if you don't do that, if you continue to repress the rights of the minority, then you are going to have to expect this kind of debate by us whenever we can

raise it. It is our duty to our constituents. It is our obligation.

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, some of us on this side of the aisle are not at all upset that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle have chosen to debate this particular issue. We hope it goes on forever and that the American public is tuned in to watch just what motivates that side of the aisle.

The fact of the matter is that the debate that they are having is between them and the White House. When people ask that the Speaker come down to present a case as to why there should be protection of the Speaker of the House, they miss the point that the people motivating that are the White House, who decided after 9/11 that the Speaker of the House, then a Republican, Mr. HASTERT, should, in fact, have the kind of the security that Americans would expect for the person who is two heartbeats away from the Presidency of the United States and that the President in this instance is consistent in that, in believing that no matter what party is holding the Speaker of the House position ought to also have that protection.

I don't think that they can propose a safer way to get the Speaker from Washington to California and back so that she can conduct the considerable responsibilities of her position and get back to do those in a timely fashion other than to fly back and forth.

But because some of my friends on the other side of the aisle apparently still don't understand it and don't understand whom they are debating with, and I understand that sometimes it is difficult to understand what is coming out of the White House, but just one more time so that even they can get it, I would like to yield to my colleague from Tennessee and ask him to read once again the other side of the debate as presented by the President of the United States in his own words.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend from Massachusetts for yielding.

Once again from the White House: "This is a silly story. I think it's been unfair to the Speaker."

And let me tell you what else is silly. It is silly for the party that inherited the biggest surplus in our Nation's or world's history and then turned it into a deficit, the biggest deficit in history, to come in here and try to be fiscally conservative.

And let me tell you what is even more silly about that. What is even more silly about that is they have a silly amendment that has been accepted; yet they want to continue to talk about the silly amendment, pretending to be fiscally conservative, although it is costing the American taxpayer to keep this RECORD going even though this amendment, silly amendment, has been accepted. And that is what is silly about this.

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I am not going to

take too much longer except to say that I for one hope that they continue to debate this silly amendment that has already been accepted, that the American public tunes in so they understand exactly what is going on here and they reconfirm the reason why the majority has shifted to this party that is now in the majority of the House.

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TIERNEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WEINER. I have only been here a few terms. We are operating under an open rule, is that correct?

Mr. TIERNEY. Yes, to the gentleman. We are operating under an open rule, which, I think, equals the number of times that the other majority of the last session had open rules during their entire session.

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would further yield, I think it is a reasonable expectation, when we have open rules in the future and we are all done debating security arrangements for the Speaker, I do not know what our colleagues are going to be talking about. I mean, they had months and months and months of leadership in the Republic Party to generate virtually nothing but standstill. Many of the people that are here on the floor from the Republic Party were shot down continually when they came to the floor trying to cut out wasteful spending. More wasteful spending happened under their leadership than, frankly, anytime in history.

The Republic Party showed such an inability to govern this country that they were vanquished into the minority arguably for the foreseeable future. The Republic Party was repudiated, but this is how they want to use their debate time, on a measure that we have accepted, on what protection to provide the Speaker.

I doubt very much, I say to the gentleman from Massachusetts, that the American people are tuning in with rapt attention to see how we are going to provide security to the Speaker. But if that is really what they think we should be having this debate about, I for one, Mr. TIERNEY, disagree. I think we should be figuring out how to do the people's business. We have already lowered their cost of college. We have increased the minimum wage. We have put an ethics plan into place. We have shown again and again we are doing the business of the American people; and the Republic Party seems, based on this debate, to be obsessed with how we provide security for the Speaker.

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Chairman, based on that, I would say to my colleague from New York that that is exactly why I hope the conversation continues on this amendment that has been accepted so that we can drive home the point again that this is the choice.

But in winding up, I would just say since we have accepted this amendment that perhaps if there is going to be more conversation, it ought to be fo-

cused on how Members suggest that they protect the Speaker of the House who has to get from Washington to California and back in some manner safely other than what the President proposes, and then they can put that information to the White House and continue the debate with the President.

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I find it ironic. What we are trying to do over here is to save the taxpayers what could be up to \$15 million, and we are accused of wasting the time and taxes of the American people by engaging in a debate to save \$15 million.

The purpose of the House of Representatives, the purpose of the people on this side, is to save money. This whole debate is about saving money. This could be easily resolved if the Speaker of the House would say: I am willing to take the smaller aircraft to land halfway in Kansas or Illinois or anywhere else, fuel up again, and head on to San Francisco. That would probably save the taxpayers \$10 million. It would be a much smaller aircraft, and it would inconvenience her by about an hour to 1½ hours. This is what this is all about.

But what really bothers me, Mr. Chairman, is the fact that those of us who are engaging in debate, this is the type of debate that the American people want because it is the type of debate that saves them money. It is all about saving the taxpayers' money. If this is not the debate that should take place, I really don't know what should take place.

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANZULLO. I will yield, absolutely. But first I want to ask you a question because you didn't yield to me.

Mr. WEINER. Sure.

Mr. MANZULLO. You accused the Republicans of being a do-nothing Congress. The last 3 days Members of Congress have been here with all the lights burning. That costs more money. We got out yesterday at 2 o'clock in the afternoon for six suspension votes, which if the Republicans were in control, we could have done in 3 hours. It took you 3 days.

And you know what, Mr. Chairman? I have heard complaints coming even from the Democratic side that they cannot understand what this calendar is all about because they can't see their children, they can't get back home to be with their constituents, and they wonder why they are here in the city of Washington debating for the last 3 days what could have taken place in 2 hours.

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANZULLO. Of course I will yield.

Mr. WEINER. First of all, let me just say your eloquent explanation of this amendment, perhaps you weren't here for all the discussion. We accept the amendment.

Mr. MANZULLO. I understand.

Mr. WIENER. It could have been law 3 hours ago.

Mr. MANZULLO. Reclaiming my time, the American people have a right to know what is in the amendment.

□ 1445

Mr. WEINER. If I could just further answer your question, because you asked a good question about the schedule; the gentleman asked a good question about the schedule. I just want, on behalf of all of us on this side of the aisle, to express our apologies for making you all work so hard. It wasn't our intention to inconvenience anybody. We are just trying to get the people's work done.

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, getting out at 2 o'clock in the afternoon—when the Republicans were in control, we were here at 10 o'clock, 11 o'clock, midnight, 2 or 3 days a week, working away on all the issues. I just find it absolutely ironic that the new Congress, intent upon coming to Washington, trying to change all the rules, to change everything, says, come back and work 3 days on six bills that could take 1 hour.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Mr. PENCE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in the midst of what has been characterized as a silly debate, and I don't rise so much to disagree with that characterization, but maybe for different reasons.

Let me say, as others have said, I was here on September 11, like many of my colleagues. I do not question the imperative of providing for the physical safety of the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives. I strongly supported the decision by the President to provide for private jet travel for the Speaker of the House then and support such transportation now. We must protect those who lead us and we must not play politics with that protection.

But let me say on the subject of whether this is a silly debate around the gentleman from Virginia's amendment, I think it is silly to question the right of the minority to question public expenditures. The gentleman from New York, whom I deeply respect, comes to the floor to question the very act of Congress being Congress. We are asking questions, in the minority, of the majority about the public expenditure of public assets; and that is precisely what Congress and the minority in Congress exists to do. I think it is altogether silly to question the right to question in the Congress.

Let me also say, Mr. Chairman, I think it is a little bit silly, some of the public consternation about a Democrat Speaker's airplane needing to be much bigger than a Republican Speaker's airplane, because to the extent that the airplane itself is a metaphor for government, I believe that we can expect

all of the government will continue to need to be much bigger under a Democrat majority in Congress.

In a very short period of time, we have seen our colleagues bring wage and price controls and raise taxes. So to part of me, with great respect for my colleagues on this side of the aisle, it is not terribly surprising that the plane needs to be bigger too. When we think of the history of entitlements under Democrat control of Congress, we might well anticipate a fleet of planes in a fairly short period of time.

But, of course, I jest. I think it is a bit of a silly debate to question the right to question in this Congress. I think my colleagues know this to be true. But I also think it is a little bit silly for the American people to ever expect government to get smaller under Democrat control.

And it is also rather silly, and I close, to think that Republicans will ever fail to come to this floor to object when government grows needlessly under a Democrat majority. We will rise to that challenge. We will object to the expansion of government, even when it takes the shape of a 757.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PENCE. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. What is silly is pretending to be a fiscal conservative while you are continuing to waste the taxpayers' dollars talking about an amendment that has been accepted. That is what is silly.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I appreciate the gentleman's sensitivity. I think the lights were already going to be paid for today, and I didn't have anywhere better to be but down here making the case for the American people for less government, less taxes. This is the role of the minority, to question, to fight for smaller government.

I commend the gentleman from Virginia for his principled stand today.

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, almost every day I stand down here and I encourage Members to sign on to my bill that Congress should not be above the law. While this debate was going on, a constituent called and said, why don't you amend that bill to also say that Congress should not be above coach or first-class travel?

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR).

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman.

Mr. Chairman, there has been a lot said on this floor today in this debate. Frankly, questions have been raised about the expectations of the American people and what it is that they seek for their Members of Congress to do.

There was one Member on the other side of the aisle who said we ought to get on with the serious business of the day. Well, Mr. Chairman, the ability to

fly on a jumbo jetliner is a privilege never before granted to a Member of Congress. And I know one thing, Mr. Chairman; the American taxpayers do expect us to take seriously the decisions surrounding the expenditure of those dollars. They expect us to respect that those tax dollars do not belong to the Speaker, do not belong to any of us. They are just that, the taxpayers' dollars.

They also expect us to lead by example, and I would want to pose to every speaker that spoke today and ask them, do they really in their heart of hearts support our Speaker having the access to a 42-seat jumbo jetliner?

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike what I really hope deep down and pray might be one of the last words.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to be practical about this. You know, I sat this morning in the ranking position as a Republican with BART as chairman over there, and we listened to the First Lady. She came before us, everybody was gracious to her, she made a good speech. One of our Members used his rights under the rules to ask her some questions. She graciously answered them. Then we came on over here. I came on over here hoping that this would be about an hour and a half or maybe 2 hours.

I served as ranking member under BART today, and I was ranking as a Democrat under BOEHLERT and SENSENBRENNER, and the only airplane I would like to be thinking about was the one I wanted to be on at 12:30 today heading for Texas.

But really and truly, I don't call anybody silly or anybody's speech that they want to make here, they need to be heard and express themselves. That is just what a lot of people call the music of democracy.

But we started out, I thought, talking about a bill that would direct the EPA, the Department of Energy and the National Institutes of Standards and Technology to initiate an R&D program to make biofuels more compatible with present-day infrastructure and to direct agencies to do so and so, to provide low-cost, affordable and accurate measurements and do all that; and it is going to cost \$10 million to carry this act out.

This bill was introduced in the 109th Congress and was included in Congresswoman BIGGERT's comprehensive energy bill. It passed under suspension of the rules last year. We didn't have all this debate about it. Everybody was for that bill. It encompassed more than what this bill started out with.

Somehow—and I like BART GORDON, and I respect him. I have known very few people from Tennessee I didn't like. If it weren't for Tennessee, there probably wouldn't even be a Texas, and that may be better off for a lot of people. And I wrote BART a letter, what is it, in the Merchant of Venice or Othello, where they said, "O, that mine enemy might write me a letter."

Maybe you should have read it, BART. Maybe you should have answered it.

I wrote him a letter to this effect, that I have conferred with my leadership, who agree that the best way to bring H.R. 547 to the floor is under a unanimous consent agreement. Given the uncontroversial nature of the bill, there is no need for us to go before the Rules Committee. And for some reason, we wound up with an open rule.

Now, I can only guess why that is. I wondered why. An open rule for a bill that everybody is already for? Give me a break. That doesn't make any sense.

So I can only think that perhaps maybe you, BART, or somebody over you, made the suggestion that, well, it looks like we are fair with that bunch of poor people over there that are in the minority now to give them a shot and tell them, yes, we have given you an open rule, probably thinking they wouldn't use it.

Well, I did not think it would be used either, but we have talked all day about everything in the world here. And there is a poem that says, "Maud Muller, on a summer's day, raked the meadow sweet with hay." The last verse lines are, "For of all sad words of tongue or pen, the saddest are these, 'It might have been!'"

It might have been that I would be on that airplane if we had taken that unanimous consent, sent this on over and gone about our business. All this other is just the music of democracy. It doesn't bother me 15 cents. And it might be a little cheaper on my government for me to ride the bus from here to Dallas every week, you know. Maybe we could talk about that some afternoon: Why doesn't RALPH HALL ride the bus to Texas and back every year? That would save money for this country.

But I have another feeling about the third person in command in this country. That is the leader, and I think she is entitled to protection and to a good way to go and to cut short the time that she has to spend in the air to get there and get home. Those things don't really bother me.

But what really bothers me is for us to sit here throwing things at one another when there is better work to do. We need to get about our business and pass this bill and let me get strapped in that airplane and go back to my grandchildren, who need me.

My son is a district judge, and I have got to go home and do a terrible thing. I have to go home and file suit against him in his own court. He threatened to spank one of my granddaughters last week. I don't have to stand for that type of thing.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL of Texas. Are you going to answer my letter? See, we can all laugh.

I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. My friend, the gentleman from Texas, that

is not a contradiction of terms. As usual, you do a good job of putting oil on the water and we thank you for that.

I thank you also for cosponsoring this bill, this bipartisan bill, that went through the hearings, this bill that will be the first real effort to deal with alternative energy.

This is part of the process, unfortunately, and we will go through it. But at the end of the day we are going to have a good bill. I thank you for being a part of that.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL of Texas. I yield to my fellow Texan.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I thank the distinguished gentleman.

Let me just add my voice of support for H.R. 547, the Advanced Fuel Infrastructure Research and Development Act. I know, Mr. Ranking Member, my good friend, we have had a colorful discussion on many, many issues. The American people are waiting to pass this bill. I add my support to H.R. 547.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 547, the Advanced Research and Development Act. H.R. 547 will make biofuels, like E85 ethanol, easier to access and use by developing new technologies that would allow retailers to offer biofuels using existing infrastructure.

Mr. Chairman, providing consumers with diverse fuel choices is crucial to the viability of a strong economy and a safe environment. First, creation of alternative fuels through research and development will not only create employment opportunities across the country, but it will also allow consumers to save money previously spent on high-priced gasoline and oil. These savings will fuel the American economy by putting more money in the pockets of consumers which they will spend on other goods and services in their local communities and across the country. Moreover, businesses will be able to reinvest those savings from lower gas and oil prices to reinvest to expand its productivity and profits. Second, investing in clean renewable energy and providing consumers with diverse fuel choices will create a cleaner environment and reverse the terrible trends that have led to the Global warming throughout the world.

H.R. 547 is a vehicle by which we can drive this country in the direction of energy independence. The high costs of oil and gas derive primarily from our overwhelming dependence on foreign oil. The Energy Information Administration estimates that the United States imports nearly 60 percent of the oil it consumes.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot even remotely begin to reduce the high price of oil and gas which has caused many of our citizens to change their standards of living, unless and until we find ways to create a more self-sufficient energy environment within the United States. Investing in clean, renewable energy is an important first step to achieving this goal.

For example, replacing oil imports with domestic alternatives such as traditional and cellulosic ethanol can not only help reduce the \$180 billion that oil contributes to our annual trade deficit, but it can also end our addiction to foreign oil. According to the Department of

Agriculture, biomass can displace 30 percent of our nation's petroleum consumption.

Under H.R. 547, costs of fuels will also decrease due to the role that the EPA, the Department of Energy and the National Institute of Standards and Technology will play in the area of research and development. The bill directs the Environmental Protection Agency EPA, in consultation with the Department of Energy DOE and the National Institute of Standards and Technology, NIST, to research and develop new technologies that would allow retailers to offer biofuels using existing infrastructure, rather than refurbishing or building new infrastructure—essentially, putting the fuel in consumers' tanks at a savings to both retailers and consumers.

Mr. Chairman, it is important for us to forge a strong surge ahead to create alternative fuels because:

Alternative fuels like E85 ethanol and some biodiesel blends have different physical and chemical properties that often make them incompatible with much of our existing infrastructure.

These fuels can experience a variety of compatibility issues, such as corrosion of tank and pipeline materials, increased sediment buildup, clogging of filters, water and microbial contamination, varying flow properties, thermal and oxidative instability, and emissions volatility.

The cost of replacing or building new infrastructure is simply not feasible for fuel retailers, most of whom are small businesses.

Even when new infrastructure is installed, those costs may be passed along to consumers.

In 2006, EPA began implementing the transition to Ultra Low Sulfur Diesel—a fuel significantly cleaner, at 15ppm sulfur, than traditional diesel, at 500ppm sulfur. Although this transition has been largely successful thus far, it is still possible that as ULSD moves from the refinery through pipelines, tanks, and trucks, it may absorb enough residual sulfur to exceed the new EPA limit.

However, there is currently no affordable, real-time mechanism for testing the sulfur content of diesel fuel at the pump.

H.R. 547 directs EPA and NIST to develop an affordable, portable, quick, and accurate way to test the sulfur content in diesel fuels.

If our country wants to decrease our dependence on foreign oil, we must get serious about creating the infrastructure necessary to distribute and dispense alternative fuels. H.R. 547 will help achieve these goals using research and development for alternative fuels and new technologies.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 547 is a sound bill that has been endorsed by the Society of Independent Gasoline Marketers of America, National Association of Convenient Stores, Renewable Fuels Association, Natural Resources Defense Council, Petroleum Marketers Association of America, NATSO representing travel plaza and truckstop owners and operators, the Coalition of E85 Retailers, and the American Petroleum Institute.

I urge my colleagues to join me in support of H.R. 547.

□ 1500

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. GINNY BROWN-WAITE OF FLORIDA

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida:

At the end of the bill, add the following new section:

#### SEC. . REPORT TO CONGRESS.

Not later than 1 year after the establishment of the program under this Act, the Secretary of Energy shall transmit a report to Congress containing suggestions for any Federal incentives that could help such program be more successful.

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Mr. Chairman, after the technologies are developed that are needed to transport safely ultra-low sulfur diesel company products, we need to have a follow-up here. The implementation will be slow without some sort of incentive to do so.

My amendment is very simple: It directs the Secretary of Energy to provide a report to Congress within 1 year, with recommendations for Federal incentives to implement the technologies developed through this program.

Mr. Chairman, it is no secret that Congress is slow at improving programs that we create and helping the markets in which they would thrive. Hopefully, this amendment will make it a little bit faster, and I urge all Members to support the amendment.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I would like to thank the gentleman for her constructive amendment to this good bipartisan bill, and we will accept that amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. TIERNEY). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE).

The amendment was agreed to.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment by Ms. ESHOO of California to the amendment by Mr. BURGESS of Texas.

Amendment by Mr. BURGESS of Texas (as amended or not).

Amendment by Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

Amendment by Mr. WELLER of Illinois.

Amendment by Mr. DENT of Pennsylvania.

Amendment by Mr. ROGERS of Michigan.

Amendment by Mr. CANTOR of Virginia.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. ESHOO TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BURGESS

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Ms. ESHOO) to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

#### RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 242, noes 185, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 81]

AYES—242

Abercrombie	Doggett	Larson (CT)
Ackerman	Donnelly	Lee
Allen	Doyle	Levin
Altmire	Edwards	Lewis (CA)
Andrews	Ellison	Lewis (GA)
Arcuri	Ellsworth	Lipinski
Baca	Emanuel	Loebach
Baird	Engel	Lofgren, Zoe
Baldwin	Eshoo	Lowey
Barrow	Etheridge	Lynch
Bartlett (MD)	Farr	Mahoney (FL)
Bean	Fattah	Maloney (NY)
Becerra	Filner	Marshall
Berkley	Frank (MA)	Matheson
Berman	Giffords	Matsui
Berry	Gilchrest	McCarthy (NY)
Bishop (GA)	Gillibrand	McCollum (MN)
Bishop (NY)	Gonzalez	McDermott
Blumenauer	Gordon	McGovern
Bordallo	Green, Al	McHugh
Boren	Green, Gene	McIntyre
Boswell	Grijalva	McNerney
Boyd (FL)	Gutierrez	McNulty
Boyda (KS)	Hall (NY)	Meehan
Brady (PA)	Hare	Meek (FL)
Braley (IA)	Harman	Meeks (NY)
Brown, Corrine	Hastings (FL)	Melancon
Butterfield	Herseth	Michaud
Capps	Higgins	Miller (NC)
Capuano	Hill	Miller, George
Cardoza	Hinchey	Mitchell
Carnahan	Hinojosa	Mollohan
Carney	Hirono	Moore (KS)
Carson	Hodes	Moore (WI)
Castle	Holden	Moran (VA)
Castor	Holt	Murphy (CT)
Chandler	Honda	Murphy, Patrick
Christensen	Hooley	Murtha
Clarke	Hoyer	Nadler
Clay	Inslee	Napolitano
Cleaver	Israel	Neal (MA)
Clyburn	Jackson (IL)	Norton
Cohen	Jackson-Lee	Oberstar
Conyers	(TX)	Obey
Cooper	Jefferson	Oliver
Costa	Johnson (GA)	Ortiz
Costello	Johnson, E. B.	Pallone
Courtney	Jones (NC)	Pascrell
Cramer	Jones (OH)	Pastor
Crowley	Kagen	Payne
Cuellar	Kanjorski	Perlmutter
Cummings	Kaptur	Peterson (MN)
Davis (AL)	Kennedy	Pomeroy
Davis (CA)	Kildee	Price (NC)
Davis (IL)	Kilpatrick	Rahall
Davis, Lincoln	Kind	Ramstad
Davis, Tom	Kirk	Rangel
DeFazio	Klein (FL)	Reyes
DeGette	Kucinich	Rodriguez
Delahunt	Lampson	Ross
DeLauro	Langevin	Roybal-Allard
Dicks	Lantos	Ruppersberger
Dingell	Larsen (WA)	

Rush	Slaughter	Velázquez
Salazar	Smith (WA)	Visclosky
Sánchez, Linda	Snyder	Walsh (NY)
T.	Solis	Walz (MN)
Sanchez, Loretta	Space	Wasserman
Sarbanes	Spratt	Schultz
Schakowsky	Stark	Waters
Schiff	Stupak	Watson
Schwartz	Sutton	Watt
Scott (GA)	Tanner	Waxman
Scott (VA)	Tauscher	Weiner
Serrano	Taylor	Welch (VT)
Sestak	Thompson (CA)	Wexler
Shays	Thompson (MS)	Wilson (OH)
Shea-Porter	Tierney	Woolsey
Sherman	Towns	Wu
Shuler	Udall (CO)	Wynn
Sires	Udall (NM)	Yarmuth
Skelton	Van Hollen	

NOES—185

Aderholt	Franks (AZ)	Neugebauer
Akin	Frelinghuysen	Nunes
Alexander	Galleghy	Paul
Bachmann	Garrett (NJ)	Pearce
Bachus	Gerlach	Pence
Baker	Gillmor	Peterson (PA)
Barrett (SC)	Gingrey	Petri
Biggert	Gohmert	Pickering
Bilbray	Goode	Pitts
Bilirakis	Goodlatte	Platts
Bishop (UT)	Granger	Poe
Blackburn	Graves	Porter
Blunt	Hall (TX)	Price (GA)
Boehner	Hayes	Putnam
Bonner	Heller	Regula
Bono	Hensarling	Rehberg
Boozman	Herger	Reichert
Boustany	Hobson	Renzi
Brady (TX)	Hoekstra	Reynolds
Brown (SC)	Hulshof	Rogers (AL)
Brown-Waite,	Hunter	Rogers (KY)
Ginny	Inglis (SC)	Rogers (MI)
Buchanan	Issa	Rohrabacher
Burgess	Jindal	Ros-Lehtinen
Burton (IN)	Johnson (IL)	Roskam
Buyer	Johnson, Sam	Royce
Calvert	Jordan	Ryan (WI)
Camp (MI)	Keller	Sali
Campbell (CA)	King (IA)	Saxton
Cannon	King (NY)	Schmidt
Cantor	Kingston	Sensenbrenner
Capito	Kline (MN)	Sessions
Carter	Knollenberg	Shadegg
Chabot	Kuhl (NY)	Shimkus
Coble	LaHood	Shuster
Cole (OK)	Lamborn	Simpson
Conaway	Latham	Smith (NE)
Crenshaw	LaTourette	Smith (NJ)
Cubin	Lewis (KY)	Smith (TX)
Culberson	Linder	Souder
Davis (KY)	LoBiondo	Stearns
Davis, David	Lucas	Sullivan
Deal (GA)	Lungren, Daniel	Tancred
Dent	E.	Terry
Diaz-Balart, L.	Mack	Thornberry
Diaz-Balart, M.	Manzullo	Tiahrt
Doolittle	Marchant	Tiberi
Drake	McCarthy (CA)	Turner
Dreier	McCaul (TX)	Upton
Duncan	McCotter	Walberg
Ehlers	McCreary	Walden (OR)
Emerson	McHenry	Wamp
English (PA)	McKeon	Weldon (FL)
Everett	McMorris	Weller
Fallin	Rodgers	Westmoreland
Feeney	Mica	Whitfield
Ferguson	Miller (FL)	Wicker
Flake	Miller (MI)	Wilson (NM)
Forbes	Miller, Gary	Wilson (SC)
Fortenberry	Moran (KS)	Wolf
Fortuño	Murphy, Tim	Young (AK)
Fossella	Musgrave	Young (FL)
Fox	Myrick	

NOT VOTING—12

Barton (TX)	Hastings (WA)	Radanovich
Boucher	Millender	Rothman
Davis, Jo Ann	McDonald	Ryan (OH)
Faleomavaega	Norwood	
Hastert	Pryce (OH)	

□ 1528

Messrs. ROGERS of Michigan, McKEON, REICHERT, ROSKAM and LATHAM changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. JOHNSON of Georgia, WALSH of New York, McHUGH, BARTLETT of Maryland, CASTLE and KIRK changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HOYER was allowed to speak out of order.)

#### LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I have had the opportunity to speak to Mr. BLUNT, the Republican whip. I want to put Members on notice early enough so they will know before they run out of here. There are going to be votes, maybe two, at least, revotes when we come out of the Committee of the Whole and into the full House.

There will be at least two votes. In conjunction with the Republican whip, we have agreed that they will be 2-minute votes. The reason I am giving that announcement now, I want all the Members to know they will be 2-minute votes so that we can try to get Members out of here on time.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue. There was no objection.

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BURGESS, AS AMENDED

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS), as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

#### RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 424, noes 0, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 82]

#### AYES—424

Abercrombie	Barrett (SC)	Blackburn
Ackerman	Barrow	Blumenauer
Aderholt	Bartlett (MD)	Blunt
Akin	Barton (TX)	Boehner
Alexander	Bean	Bonner
Allen	Becerra	Bono
Altmire	Berkley	Boozman
Andrews	Berman	Bordallo
Arcuri	Berry	Boren
Baca	Biggert	Boswell
Bachmann	Bilbray	Boustany
Bachus	Bilirakis	Boyd (FL)
Baird	Bishop (GA)	Boyd (KS)
Baker	Bishop (NY)	Brady (PA)
Baldwin	Bishop (UT)	Brady (TX)

Braley (IA)	Gerlach	Mack
Brown (SC)	Giffords	Mahoney (FL)
Brown, Corrine	Gilchrest	Maloney (NY)
Brown-Waite,	Gillibrand	Manzullo
Ginny	Gillmor	Marchant
Buchanan	Gingrey	Markey
Burgess	Gohmert	Marshall
Burton (IN)	Gonzalez	Matheson
Butterfield	Goode	Matsui
Buyer	Goodlatte	McCarthy (CA)
Calvert	Gordon	McCarthy (NY)
Camp (MI)	Granger	McCaul (TX)
Campbell (CA)	Graves	McCollum (MN)
Cannon	Green, Al	McCotter
Cantor	Green, Gene	McCrery
Capito	Grijalva	McDermott
Capps	Gutierrez	McGovern
Capuano	Hall (NY)	McHenry
Cardoza	Hall (TX)	McHugh
Carnahan	Hare	McIntyre
Carney	Harman	McKeon
Carson	Hastings (FL)	McMorris
Carter	Hayes	Rodgers
Castle	Heller	McNerney
Castor	Hensarling	McNulty
Chabot	Herger	Meehan
Chandler	Herseeth	Meek (FL)
Christensen	Higgins	Meeks (NY)
Clarke	Hill	Melancon
Clay	Hinchey	Mica
Cleaver	Hinojosa	Michaud
Clyburn	Hirono	Miller (FL)
Coble	Hobson	Miller (MI)
Cohen	Hodes	Miller (NC)
Cole (OK)	Hoekstra	Miller, Gary
Conaway	Holden	Miller, George
Conyers	Holt	Mitchell
Cooper	Honda	Mollohan
Costa	Hooley	Moore (KS)
Costello	Hoyer	Moore (WI)
Courtney	Hulshof	Moran (KS)
Cramer	Hunter	Moran (VA)
Crenshaw	Inglis (SC)	Murphy (CT)
Crowley	Inslee	Murphy, Patrick
Cubin	Israel	Murphy, Tim
Cuellar	Issa	Murtha
Cummings	Jackson (IL)	Musgrave
Davis (AL)	Jackson-Lee	Myrick
Davis (CA)	(TX)	Nadler
Davis (IL)	Jefferson	Napolitano
Davis (KY)	Jindal	Neal (MA)
Davis, David	Johnson (GA)	Neugebauer
Davis, Lincoln	Johnson (IL)	Norton
Davis, Tom	Johnson, E. B.	Nunes
Deal (GA)	Johnson, Sam	Oberstar
DeFazio	Jones (NC)	Obey
DeGette	Jones (OH)	Olver
Delahunt	Jordan	Ortiz
DeLauro	Kagen	Pallone
Dent	Kanjorski	Pascarell
Diaz-Balart, L.	Kaptur	Pastor
Diaz-Balart, M.	Keller	Paul
Dicks	Kennedy	Payne
Dingell	Kildee	Pearce
Doggett	Kilpatrick	Pence
Donnelly	Kind	Perlmutter
Doolittle	King (IA)	Peterson (MN)
Doyle	King (NY)	Peterson (PA)
Drake	Kingston	Petri
Dreier	Kirk	Pickering
Duncan	Klein (FL)	Pitts
Edwards	Kline (MN)	Platts
Ehlers	Knollenberg	Poe
Ellison	Kucinich	Pomeroy
Ellsworth	Kuhl (NY)	Porter
Emanuel	LaHood	Price (GA)
Emerson	Lamborn	Price (NC)
Engel	Lampson	Putnam
English (PA)	Langevin	Rahall
Eshoo	Lantos	Ramstad
Etheridge	Larsen (WA)	Rangel
Everett	Larson (CT)	Regula
Fallin	Latham	Rehberg
Farr	LaTourette	Reichert
Fattah	Lee	Renzi
Feeney	Levin	Reyes
Ferguson	Lewis (CA)	Reynolds
Fliner	Lewis (GA)	Rodriguez
Flake	Lewis (KY)	Rogers (AL)
Forbes	Linder	Rogers (KY)
Fortenberry	Lipinski	Rogers (MI)
Fortuño	LoBiondo	Rohrabacher
Fossella	Loeb sack	Ros-Lehtinen
Fox	Lofgren, Zoe	Roskam
Frank (MA)	Lowe	Ross
Franks (AZ)	Lucas	Roybal-Allard
Frelinghuysen	Lungren, Daniel	Royce
Gallegly	E.	Ruppersberger
Garrett (NJ)	Lynch	Rush

Ryan (WI)	Smith (NJ)	Walden (OR)
Salazar	Smith (TX)	Walsh (NY)
Sali	Smith (WA)	Walz (MN)
Sánchez, Linda	Snyder	Wamp
T.	Solis	Wasserman
Sanchez, Loretta	Souder	Schultz
Sarbanes	Spratt	Waters
Saxton	Stark	Watson
Schakowsky	Stearns	Watt
Schiff	Stupak	Waxman
Schmidt	Sutton	Weiner
Schwartz	Tancredo	Welch (VT)
Scott (GA)	Tanner	Weldon (FL)
Scott (VA)	Tauscher	Weller
Sensenbrenner	Taylor	Westmoreland
Serrano	Terry	Wexler
Sessions	Thompson (CA)	Whitfield
Sestak	Thompson (MS)	Wicker
Shadegg	Thornberry	Wilson (NM)
Shays	Tiahrt	Wilson (OH)
Shea-Porter	Tiberi	Wilson (SC)
Sherman	Tierney	Wolf
Shimkus	Towns	Woolsey
Shuler	Turner	Wu
Shuster	Udall (CO)	Wynn
Simpson	Udall (NM)	Yarmuth
Sires	Upton	Young (AK)
Skelton	Van Hollen	Young (FL)
Slaughter	Visclosky	
Smith (NE)	Walberg	

#### NOT VOTING—15

Boucher	Millender	Ryan (OH)
Culberson	McDonald	Space
Davis, Jo Ann	Norwood	Sullivan
Faleomavaega	Pryce (OH)	Velázquez
Hastert	Radanovich	
Hastings (WA)	Rothman	

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1537

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WELLER OF ILLINOIS

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

#### RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 424, noes 0, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 83]

#### AYES—424

Abercrombie	Bartlett (MD)	Bonner
Ackerman	Barton (TX)	Bono
Aderholt	Bean	Boozman
Akin	Becerra	Bordallo
Alexander	Berkley	Boren
Allen	Berman	Boswell
Altmire	Berry	Boustany
Andrews	Biggert	Boyd (FL)
Arcuri	Bilbray	Boyd (KS)
Baca	Bilirakis	Brady (PA)
Bachmann	Bishop (GA)	Brady (TX)
Bachus	Bishop (NY)	Braley (IA)
Baird	Bishop (UT)	Brown (SC)
Baker	Blackburn	Brown, Corrine
Baldwin	Blumenauer	Brown-Waite,
Barrett (SC)	Blunt	Ginny
Barrow	Boehner	Buchanan

Burgess	Gingrey	Matheson	Schiff	Spratt	Walz (MN)	Doyle	Kline (MN)	Regula
Burton (IN)	Gohmert	Matsui	Schmidt	Stark	Wamp	Drake	Knollenberg	Rehberg
Butterfield	Gonzalez	McCarthy (CA)	Schwartz	Stearns	Wasserman	Dreier	Kuhl (NY)	Reichert
Buyer	Goode	McCarthy (NY)	Scott (GA)	Stupak	Schultz	Duncan	LaHood	Renzi
Calvert	Goodlatte	McCaul (TX)	Scott (VA)	Sullivan	Ehlers	Lamborn	Reynolds	Reynolds
Camp (MI)	Gordon	McCollum (MN)	Sensenbrenner	Sutton	Emerson	Langevin	Rogers (AL)	Rogers (AL)
Campbell (CA)	Granger	McCotter	Serrano	Tancredo	Watt	English (PA)	Latham	Rogers (KY)
Cannon	Graves	McCrery	Sessions	Tanner	Waxman	Everett	LaTourette	Rogers (MI)
Cantor	Green, Al	McDermott	Sestak	Tauscher	Weiner	Fallin	Lewis (CA)	Rohrabacher
Capito	Green, Gene	McGovern	Shadegg	Taylor	Welch (VT)	Feeney	Lewis (KY)	Ros-Lehtinen
Capps	Grijalva	McHenry	Shays	Terry	Weldon (FL)	Ferguson	Linder	Roskam
Capuano	Gutierrez	McHugh	Shea-Porter	Thompson (CA)	Weller	Forbes	LoBiondo	Royce
Cardoza	Hall (NY)	McIntyre	Sherman	Thompson (MS)	Westmoreland	Fortenberry	Lungren, Daniel E.	Ryan (WI)
Carnahan	Hall (TX)	McKeon	Shimkus	Thornberry	Wexler	Fortuño	Sali	Saxton
Carney	Hare	McMorris	Shuler	Tiahrt	Whitfield	Fossella	Mack	Schmidt
Carson	Harman	Rodgers	Shuster	Tiberi	Wick	Fox	Manzullo	Schwartz
Carter	Hastings (FL)	McNerney	Simpson	Tierney	Wicker	Franks (AZ)	Marchant	Schwartz
Castle	Hayes	McNulty	Sires	Towns	Wilson (NM)	Frelinghuysen	Marshall	Sensenbrenner
Castor	Heller	Meehan	Skelton	Turner	Wilson (OH)	Gallegly	McCarthy (CA)	Sessions
Chabot	Hensarling	Meek (FL)	Slaughter	Udall (CO)	Wilson (SC)	Garrett (NJ)	McCaul (TX)	Sestak
Chandler	Herger	Meeks (NY)	Smith (NE)	Udall (NM)	Wolf	Gerlach	McCotter	Shays
Christensen	Hereth	Melancon	Smith (NJ)	Upton	Woodsey	Gilchrest	McCrery	Shimkus
Clarke	Higgins	Mica	Smith (TX)	Van Hollen	Wu	Gillmor	McHenry	Shuster
Clay	Hill	Michaud	Smith (WA)	Velázquez	Wynn	Gingrey	McHugh	Simpson
Cleaver	Hinche	Miller (FL)	Snyder	Visclosky	Yarmuth	Gohmert	McKeon	Smith (NE)
Clyburn	Hinojosa	Miller (MI)	Solis	Walberg	Young (AK)	Goode	McMorris	Smith (NJ)
Coble	Hirono	Miller (NC)	Souder	Walden (OR)	Young (FL)	Goodlatte	Rodgers	Smith (TX)
Cohen	Hobson	Miller, Gary	Space	Walsh (NY)		Granger	Mica	Souder
Cole (OK)	Hodes	Miller, George				Graves	Michaud	Stark
Conaway	Hoekstra	Mitchell				Hall (NY)	Miller (FL)	Stearns
Conyers	Holden	Moore (KS)	Boucher	LaTourette	Radanovich	Hall (TX)	Miller (MI)	Stupak
Cooper	Holt	Moore (WI)	Davis, Jo Ann	Millender-	Rothman	Hare	Miller, Gary	Sullivan
Costa	Honda	Moran (KS)	Faleomavaega	McDonald	Rush	Hayes	Mollohan	Tancredo
Costello	Hooley	Moran (VA)	Hastert	Mollohan	Ryan (OH)	Heller	Moore (KS)	Terry
Courtney	Hoyer	Murphy (CT)	Hastings (WA)	Norwood		Hensarling	Murphy, Patrick	Tiahrt
Cramer	Hulshof	Murphy, Patrick	Hunter	Pryce (OH)		Herger	Murphy, Tim	Thornberry
Crenshaw	Inglis (SC)	Murphy, Tim				Hereth	Murtha	Tiberi
Crowley	Inslee	Murtha				Hill	Musgrave	Turner
Cubin	Israel	Musgrave				Hobson	Myrick	Udall (NM)
Cuellar	Issa	Myrick				Hoekstra	Neugebauer	Upton
Culberson	Jackson (IL)	Nadler				Holden	Nunes	Van Hollen
Cummings	Jackson-Lee (TX)	Napolitano				Hulshof	Oberstar	Walberg
Davis (AL)	Jefferson	Neal (MA)				Hunter	Paul	Walden (OR)
Davis (CA)	Jindal	Neugebauer				Inglis (SC)	Pearce	Walsh (NY)
Davis (IL)	Johnson (GA)	Norton				Issa	Pence	Wamp
Davis (KY)	Johnson (IL)	Nunes				Jindal	Peterson (PA)	Watt
Davis, David	Johnson (IL)	Oberstar				Johnson (IL)	Petri	Weldon (FL)
Davis, Lincoln	Johnson, E. B.	Obey				Johnson, Sam	Pickering	Weller
Davis, Tom	Johnson, Sam	Olver				Jones (NC)	Pitts	Westmoreland
Deal (GA)	Jones (NC)	Ortiz				Jordan	Platts	Wicker
DeFazio	Jones (OH)	Pallone				Kanjorski	Poe	Wilson (NM)
DeGette	Jordan	Pascarell				Keller	Pomeroy	Wolf
Delahunt	Kagen	Pastor				King (IA)	Porter	Wu
DeLauro	Kanjorski	Paul				King (NY)	Price (GA)	Young (AK)
Dent	Kaptur	Payne				Kingston	Putnam	
Diaz-Balart, L.	Keller	Pearce				Kirk	Rahall	
Diaz-Balart, M.	Kennedy	Pence				Klein (FL)	Ramstad	
Dicks	Kildee	Perlmutter						
Dingell	Kilpatrick	Peterson (MN)						
Doggett	Kind	Peterson (PA)						
Donnelly	King (IA)	Petri						
Doolittle	King (NY)	Pickering						
Doyle	Kingston	Pitts						
Drake	Kirk	Platts						
Dreier	Klein (FL)	Poe						
Duncan	Kline (MN)	Pomeroy						
Edwards	Knollenberg	Porter						
Ehlers	Kucinich	Price (GA)						
Ellison	Kuhl (NY)	Price (NC)						
Ellsworth	LaHood	Putnam						
Emanuel	Lamborn	Rahall						
Emerson	Lampson	Ramstad						
Engel	Langevin	Rangel						
English (PA)	Lantos	Regula						
Eshoo	Larsen (WA)	Rehberg						
Etheridge	Larson (CT)	Reichert						
Everett	Latham	Renzi						
Fallin	Lee	Reyes						
Farr	Levin	Reynolds						
Fattah	Lewis (CA)	Rodriguez						
Feeney	Lewis (GA)	Rogers (AL)						
Ferguson	Lewis (KY)	Rogers (KY)						
Filner	Linder	Rogers (MI)						
Flake	Lipinski	Rohrabacher						
Forbes	LoBiondo	Ros-Lehtinen						
Fortenberry	Loeb	Roskam						
Fortuño	Lofgren, Zoe	Ross						
Fossella	Lowey	Roybal-Allard						
Fox	Lucas	Royce						
Frank (MA)	Lungren, Daniel E.	Ruppersberger						
Franks (AZ)	Lynch	Ryan (WI)						
Frelinghuysen	Mack	Salazar						
Gallegly	Manzullo	Sali						
Garrett (NJ)	Marchant	Sánchez, Linda T.						
Gerlach	Markey	Sanchez, Loretta						
Giffords	Marshall	Sarbanes						
Gilchrest		Saxton						
Gillibrand		Schakowsky						
Gillmor								

## NOT VOTING—15

LaTourette  
Millender-  
McDonald  
Mollohan  
Norwood  
Pryce (OH)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN  
The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1546

So the amendment was agreed to.  
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DENT

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 226, noes 201, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 84]

AYES—226

Abercrombie	Boozman	Castle
Aderholt	Boustany	Chabot
Akin	Brady (TX)	Coble
Alexander	Brady (IA)	Cole (OK)
Altmire	Brown (SC)	Costa
Bachmann	Brown-Waite,	Costello
Bachus	Ginny	Crenshaw
Baker	Buchanan	Cubin
Barrett (SC)	Burgess	Cuellar
Bartlett (MD)	Burton (IN)	Culberson
Barton (TX)	Buyer	Davis (KY)
Berkley	Calvert	Davis, David
Biggart	Camp (MI)	Davis, Tom
Bilbray	Campbell (CA)	Deal (GA)
Bilirakis	Cannon	DeFazio
Bishop (GA)	Cantor	Dent
Blunt	Capito	Diaz-Balart, L.
Boehner	Carnahan	Diaz-Balart, M.
Bonner	Carney	Dicks
Bono	Carter	Doolittle

## NOES—201

Ackerman	Crowley	Honda
Allen	Cummings	Hooley
Andrews	Davis (AL)	Hoyer
Arcuri	Davis (CA)	Inslee
Baca	Davis (IL)	Israel
Baird	Davis, Lincoln	Jackson (IL)
Baldwin	DeGette	Jackson-Lee
Barrow	Delahunt	(TX)
Bean	DeLauro	Jefferson
Becerra	Dingell	Johnson (GA)
Berman	Doggett	Johnson, E. B.
Berry	Donnelly	Jones (OH)
Bishop (NY)	Edwards	Kagen
Blackburn	Ellison	Kaptur
Blumenauer	Ellsworth	Kennedy
Bordallo	Emanuel	Kildee
Boren	Engel	Kilpatrick
Boswell	Eshoo	Kind
Boyd (FL)	Etheridge	Kucinich
Boyda (KS)	Farr	Lampson
Brady (PA)	Fattah	Lantos
Brown, Corrine	Filner	Larsen (WA)
Butterfield	Flake	Larson (CT)
Capps	Frank (MA)	Lee
Capuano	Giffords	Levin
Cardoza	Gillibrand	Lewis (GA)
Carson	Gonzalez	Lipinski
Castor	Gordon	Loeb
Chandler	Green, Al	Lofgren, Zoe
Christensen	Green, Gene	Lowey
Clarke	Grijalva	Lucas
Clay	Gutierrez	Lynch
Cleaver	Harman	Maloney (FL)
Clyburn	Hastings (FL)	Maloney (NY)
Cohen	Higgins	Markey
Conaway	Hinche	Matheson
Conyers	Hinojosa	Matsui
Cooper	Hirono	McCarthy (NY)
Courtney	Hodes	McCollum (MN)
Cramer	Holt	McDermott

McGovern	Price (NC)	Space	Brady (PA)	Garrett (NJ)	Mack	Sánchez, Linda	Smith (WA)	Walberg
McIntyre	Rangel	Spratt	Brady (TX)	Gerlach	Mahoney (FL)	T.	Snyder	Walden (OR)
McNerney	Reyes	Sutton	Braley (IA)	Giffords	Maloney (NY)	Sánchez, Loretta	Souder	Walsh (NY)
McNulty	Rodriguez	Tanner	Brown (SC)	Gilchrest	Manzullo	Sarbanes	Space	Walz (MN)
Meehan	Ross	Tauscher	Brown, Corrine	Gillibrand	Marchant	Saxton	Spratt	Wamp
Meek (FL)	Roybal-Allard	Taylor	Brown-Waite,	Gillmor	Markey	Schakowsky	Stark	Waters
Meeks (NY)	Velázquez	Thompson (CA)	Ginny	Gingrey	Marshall	Schiff	Stearns	Watson
Melancon	Rush	Thompson (MS)	Buchanan	Gohmert	Matheson	Schmidt	Stupak	Watt
Miller (NC)	Salazar	Tierney	Burgess	Gonzalez	Matsui	Schwartz	Sullivan	Waxman
Miller, George	Sánchez, Linda	Towns	Burton (IN)	Goode	McCarthy (CA)	Scott (GA)	Sutton	Weiner
Mitchell	T.	Udall (CO)	Butterfield	Goodlatte	McCarthy (NY)	Scott (VA)	Tancredo	Welch (VT)
Moore (WI)	Sánchez, Loretta	Velázquez	Buyer	Gordon	McCaul (TX)	Sensenbrenner	Tanner	Weldon (FL)
Moran (KS)	Sarbanes	Visclosky	Calvert	Granger	McCollum (MN)	Serrano	Tauscher	Weller
Moran (VA)	Schakowsky	Walz (MN)	Camp (MI)	Graves	McCotter	Sessions	Taylor	Westmoreland
Murphy (CT)	Schiff	Wasserman	Campbell (CA)	Green, Al	McCrery	Sestak	Terry	Wexler
Nadler	Scott (GA)	Schultz	Cannon	Green, Gene	McDermott	Shadegg	Thompson (CA)	Whitfield
Napolitano	Scott (VA)	Waters	Cantor	Grijalva	McGovern	Shays	Thompson (MS)	Wicker
Neal (MA)	Serrano	Watson	Capito	Gutierrez	McHenry	Shea-Porter	Thornberry	Wilson (NM)
Norton	Shadegg	Waxman	Capps	Hall (NY)	McHugh	Sherman	Tiahrt	Wilson (OH)
Obey	Shea-Porter	Weiner	Capuano	Hall (TX)	McIntyre	Shimkus	Tiberi	Wilson (SC)
Olver	Sherman	Welch (VT)	Cardoza	Hare	McKeon	Shuler	Tierney	Wolf
Ortiz	Shuler	Wexler	Carnahan	Harman	McMorris	Shuster	Towns	Woolsey
Pallone	Sires	Whitfield	Carney	Hastings (FL)	Rodgers	Simpson	Turner	Wu
Pascarell	Skelton	Wilson (OH)	Carson	Hayes	McNerney	Sires	Udall (CO)	Wynn
Pastor	Slaughter	Woolsey	Carter	Heller	McNulty	Skellton	Udall (NM)	Yarmuth
Payne	Smith (WA)	Wynn	Castle	Herger	Meehan	Slaughter	Upton	Young (AK)
Perlmutter	Snyder	Yarmuth	Castor	Herseeth	Meek (FL)	Smith (NE)	Van Hollen	Young (FL)
Peterson (MN)	Solis	Young (FL)	Chabot	Higgins	Meeks (NY)	Smith (NJ)	Velázquez	
			Chandler	Hill	Melancon	Smith (TX)	Visclosky	

## NOT VOTING—12

Bishop (UT)	Hastings (WA)	Radanovich
Boucher	Millender-	Rothman
Davis, Jo Ann	McDonald	Ryan (OH)
Faleomavaega	Norwood	
Hastert	Pryce (OH)	

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised that 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1555

Messrs. UDALL of Colorado, LYNCH and AL GREEN of Texas changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mr. CUELLAR changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF MICHIGAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ROGERS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 419, noes 6, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 85]

## AYES—419

Abercrombie	Baldwin	Bishop (NY)
Ackerman	Barrett (SC)	Bishop (UT)
Aderholt	Barrow	Blumenauer
Akin	Bartlett (MD)	Blunt
Alexander	Barton (TX)	Boehner
Allen	Bean	Bonner
Altmire	Becerra	Bono
Andrews	Berkley	Boozman
Arcuri	Berman	Bordallo
Baca	Berry	Boren
Bachmann	Biggart	Boswell
Bachus	Bilbray	Boustany
Baird	Bilirakis	Boyd (FL)
Baker	Bishop (GA)	Boyda (KS)

Bishop (NY)	Bishop (UT)	Blumenauer
Blunt	Boehner	Bonner
Bono	Boozman	Bordallo
Boren	Boswell	Boustany
Boyd (FL)	Boyd (KS)	Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)		
Brown (SC)	Brown, Corrine	Brown-Waite,
Brown-Waite,	Ginny	Buchanan
Burgess	Burton (IN)	Butterfield
Cannon	Cantor	Capito
Capps	Cardoza	Carnahan
Carney	Carson	Carter
Castle	Castor	Chabot
Chandler	Christensen	Clarke
Clarke	Clay	Cleaver
Clyburn	Coble	Cohen
Cole (OK)	Conaway	Conyers
Cooper	Costa	Costello
Courtney	Cramer	Crenshaw
Crowley	Cubin	Cuellar
Culberson	Cummings	Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)	Davis (IL)	Davis (KY)
Davis, David	Davis, David	Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom	Deal (GA)	DeFazio
DeGette	DeLauro	Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.	Diaz-Balart, M.	Dicks
Dingell	Doggett	Donnelly
Doolittle	Doyle	Drake
Dreier	Duncan	Edwards
Ehlers	Ellison	Ellsworth
Emanuel	Emerson	Engel
English (PA)	Eshoo	Etheridge
Everett	Fallin	Farr
Fattah	Ferguson	Filner
Forbes	Fortenberry	Fortuño
Fossella	Fox	Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)	Frelinghuysen	Gallegly
Gingrey	Gohmert	Gonzalez
Goode	Goodlatte	Gordon
Granger	Graves	Green, Al
Green, Gene	Grijalva	Gutierrez
Hall (NY)	Hall (TX)	Hare
Harman	Hastings (FL)	Hayes
Heller	Herger	Herseeth
Higgins	Hill	Hinchey
Hinojosa	Hirono	Hobson
Hodes	Hoekstra	Holden
Holt	Honda	Huelskamp
Hooley	Hoyer	Hulshof
Ingle	Issa	Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee	(TX)	Jefferson
Jindal	Johnson (GA)	Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.	Johnson, Sam	Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)	Jordan	Kagen
Kanjorski	Kaptur	Keller
Kennedy	Kildee	Kilpatrick
Kilpatrick	Kind	King (IA)
King (NY)	Kingston	Kirk
Klein (FL)	Kline (MN)	Knollenberg
Kucinich	Kuhl (NY)	LaHood
Lamborn	Lampson	Langevin
Lantos	Larsen (WA)	Latham
LaTourette	Lee	Levin
Lewis (CA)	Lewis (GA)	Lewis (KY)
Linder	Lipinski	LoBiondo
Loeb	Loeb	Loeb
Loftgren, Zoe	Lowey	Lucas
Lungren, Daniel	E.	Lynch

Mica	Michaud	Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)	Miller (NC)	Miller, Gary
Miller, George	Mitchell	Mollohan
Moore (KS)	Moore (WI)	Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)	Murphy (CT)	Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim	Murtha	Musgrave
Myrick	Nadler	Napolitano
Neal (MA)	Neugebauer	Norton
Nunes	Oberstar	Obey
Oliver	Ortiz	Pallone
Pascarell	Pastor	Payne
Pearce	Pence	Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)	Peterson (PA)	Petri
Pickering	Pitts	Platts
Poe	Pomeroy	Porter
Price (GA)	Price (NC)	Putnam
Rahall	Ramstad	Rangel
Rehberg	Reichert	Renzi
Reyes	Reynolds	Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)	Rogers (KY)	Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher	Ros-Lehtinen	Roskam
Ross	Roybal-Allard	Ruppersberger
Rush	Ryan (WI)	Salazar

Blackburn	Flake	Royce
Feeney	Paul	Sali

## NOES—6

## NOT VOTING—14

Boucher	Millender-	Ryan (OH)
Davis, Jo Ann	McDonald	Solis
Faleomavaega	Norwood	Wasserman
Hastert	Pryce (OH)	Schultz
Hastings (WA)	Radanovich	
Hensarling	Rothman	

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised that 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1601

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CANTOR

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 422, noes 3, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 86]

## AYES—422

Abercrombie	Barrett (SC)	Blackburn
Ackerman	Barrow	Blumenauer
Aderholt	Bartlett (MD)	Blunt
Akin	Barton (TX)	Boehner
Alexander	Bean	Bonner
Allen	Becerra	Bono
Altmire	Berkley	Boozman
Andrews	Berman	Bordallo
Arcuri	Berry	Boren
Baca	Biggart	Boswell
Bachmann	Bilbray	Boustany
Bachus	Bilirakis	Boyd (FL)
Baird	Bishop (GA)	Boyda (KS)
Baker	Bishop (NY)	Brady (PA)
Baldwin	Bishop (UT)	Brady (TX)

Braley (IA)  
Brown (SC)  
Brown, Corrine  
Brown-Waite,  
Ginny  
Buchanan  
Burgess  
Burton (IN)  
Butterfield  
Buyer  
Calvert  
Camp (MI)  
Campbell (CA)  
Cannon  
Cantor  
Capito  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cardoza  
Carnahan  
Carney  
Carson  
Carter  
Castle  
Castor  
Chabot  
Chandler  
Christensen  
Clarke  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Coble  
Cohen  
Cole (OK)  
Conaway  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Costa  
Costello  
Courtney  
Cramer  
Crenshaw  
Crowley  
Cubin  
Cuellar  
Culberson  
Cummins  
Davis (AL)  
Davis (CA)  
Davis (IL)  
Davis (KY)  
Davis, David  
Davis, Lincoln  
Davis, Tom  
Deal (GA)  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delahunt  
DeLauro  
Dent  
Diaz-Balart, L.  
Diaz-Balart, M.  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Donnelly  
Doolittle  
Doyle  
Drake  
Dreier  
Duncan  
Edwards  
Ehlers  
Ellison  
Ellsworth  
Emanuel  
Emerson  
Engel  
English (PA)  
Eshoo  
Etheridge  
Everett  
Fallin  
Farr  
Fattah  
Feeney  
Ferguson  
Filner  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Fortuño  
Fossella  
Foxy  
Frank (MA)  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Gallegly  
Garrett (NJ)

Gerlach  
Giffords  
Gilchrest  
Gillibrand  
Gillmor  
Gingrey  
Gohmert  
Gonzalez  
Goode  
Goodlatte  
Gordon  
Granger  
Graves  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Grijalva  
Gutierrez  
Hall (NY)  
Hall (TX)  
Hare  
Harman  
Hastings (FL)  
Hayes  
Heller  
Hensarling  
Herger  
Herseth  
Higgins  
Hill  
Hinchey  
Hinojosa  
Hirono  
Hobson  
Hodes  
Hoekstra  
Holden  
Holt  
Honda  
Hooley  
Hoyer  
Hulshof  
Hunter  
Inglis (SC)  
Inslee  
Israel  
Issa  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson-Lee  
(TX)  
Jefferson  
Jindal  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson (IL)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones (NC)  
Jordan  
Kagen  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Keller  
Kennedy  
Kildee  
Kilpatrick  
Kind  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Kirk  
Klein (FL)  
Kline (MN)  
Knollenberg  
Kucinich  
Kuhl (NY)  
Lamborn  
Lampson  
Langevin  
Lantos  
Larsen (WA)  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (GA)  
Lewis (KY)  
Linder  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Loebach  
Lofgren, Zoe  
Lowey  
Lucas  
Lungren, Daniel  
E.  
Lynch  
Mack  
Mahoney (FL)  
Maloney (NY)

Manzullo  
Marchant  
Markley  
Marshall  
Matheson  
Matsui  
McCarthy (CA)  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCaul (TX)  
McCollum (MN)  
McCotter  
McCrery  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McHenry  
McHugh  
McIntyre  
McKeon  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McNerney  
McNulty  
Meehan  
Meek (FL)  
Meeks (NY)  
Melancon  
Mica  
Michaud  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Miller (NC)  
Miller, Gary  
Mitchell  
Mollohan  
Moore (KS)  
Moore (WI)  
Moran (KS)  
Moran (VA)  
Murphy (CT)  
Murphy, Patrick  
Murphy, Tim  
Murtha  
Musgrave  
Myrick  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal (MA)  
Neugebauer  
Norton  
Nunes  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Oliver  
Ortiz  
Pallone  
Pascarell  
Pastor  
Payne  
Pearce  
Pence  
Perlmutter  
Peterson (MN)  
Peterson (PA)  
Petri  
Pickering  
Pitts  
Platts  
Poe  
Pomeroy  
Porter  
Price (GA)  
Price (NC)  
Putnam  
Rahall  
Ramstad  
Rangel  
Regula  
Rehberg  
Reichert  
Renzi  
Reyes  
Reynolds  
Rodriguez  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross  
Roybal-Allard  
Royce  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (WI)  
Salazar  
Sali

Sánchez, Linda  
T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes  
Saxton  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schmidt  
Schwartz  
Scott (GA)  
Scott (VA)  
Sensenbrenner  
Serrano  
Sessions  
Sestak  
Shadegg  
Shays  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Shimkus  
Shuler  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Sires  
Skelton  
Slaughter  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)

Smith (WA)  
Snyder  
Solis  
Souder  
Space  
Spratt  
Stark  
Stearns  
Stupak  
Sullivan  
Sutton  
Tancredo  
Tanner  
Tauscher  
Taylor  
Terry  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Thornberry  
Tiahrt  
Tiberi  
Tierney  
Towns  
Turner  
Udall (CO)  
Udall (NM)  
Upton  
Van Hollen  
Velázquez

Visclosky  
Walberg  
Walden (OR)  
Walsh (NY)  
Walz (MN)  
Wamp  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Watson  
Watt  
Waxman  
Weiner  
Welch (VT)  
Weldon (FL)  
Weller  
Westmoreland  
Wexler  
Wicker  
Wilson (NM)  
Wilson (OH)  
Wilson (SC)  
Wolf  
Woolsey  
Wu  
Wynn  
Yarmuth  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)

## NOES—3

Flake  
LaHood  
Paul

## NOT VOTING—14

Boucher  
Davis, Jo Ann  
Faleomavaega  
Hastert  
Hastings (WA)  
Jones (OH)  
Larson (CT)  
Millender-  
McDonald  
Norwood  
Pryce (OH)  
Radanovich  
Rothman  
Ryan (OH)  
Whitfield

□ 1608

So the amendment was agreed to.  
The result of the vote was announced  
as above recorded.

## PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Chairman, I have a  
parliamentary inquiry.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gen-  
tleman will state it.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Chairman, on the  
vote just taken, the Chair announced  
the vote as 422-3. Should the Chair not  
have delineated the vote to properly re-  
flect that the vote was 418-3 of those  
Representatives representing the sev-  
eral States as specified in the Constitu-  
tion, and that the votes of those Dele-  
gates not representing States was 4-0?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. No.

Mr. BLUNT. I have a further par-  
liamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman. The  
further parliamentary inquiry is, am I  
accurate in believing that all of these  
votes can be revoted once we rise from  
the Committee of the Whole?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Those that  
are adopted may be revoted.

Mr. BLUNT. I thank the chairman.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Only those  
amendments adopted in the first degree  
may be revoted. Second-degree amend-  
ments may not be isolated for separate  
votes.

Mr. BLUNT. Those amendments that  
passed in the Committee of the Whole  
in the first degree would all be subject  
to be revoted?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. That is cor-  
rect.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, I have a  
parliamentary inquiry in that regard.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gen-  
tleman will state it.

Mr. TERRY. A question was posed by  
a parliamentary inquiry during the  
Committee of the Whole earlier asking

specifically if secondary amendments  
could also be revoted, and the answer  
from the Chair was all amendments. It  
appears that the ruling from the Chair  
or the answer to the whip's parliamen-  
tary inquiry is different from an an-  
swer previously given to a similar  
question.

Could the Chair please clarify?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gen-  
tleman is correct. Those amendments  
adopted in the first degree are able to  
be voted upon and those in the second  
degree are not.

Mr. TERRY. So the clarification  
from the earlier ruling is not all  
amendments, but all first-degree  
amendments, even though the question  
earlier was posed on second-degree  
amendments. I thank the Chair.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The speaker  
could address that question in the  
House, which would be preferable to its  
being addressed by the Chairman of the  
Committee of the Whole.

Are there any further amendments?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BURGESS

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, I offer  
an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BURGESS of  
Texas:

Page 5, after line 21, insert the following  
new section:

## SEC. 7. ADDITIONAL ISSUES.

Research and development under this Act  
shall address issues with respect to increased  
volatile emissions or increased nitrogen  
oxide emissions.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, earlier  
during this process, the gentleman  
from New Jersey (Mr. FERGUSON) and I  
offered an amendment, but it did not  
receive a clean vote. I have redrafted  
the amendment to more comprehen-  
sively addressed emissions from the in-  
creased use of biofuels or additives cov-  
ered in the research and development  
program in this bill.

Republicans and Democrats should be  
thought of as being environmentally  
friendly, and I found myself in the posi-  
tion of arguing for a more stringent  
standard than some of my Democratic  
colleagues.

Mr. Chairman, MTBE was an addi-  
tive. Additives can cause environ-  
mental harm. We need to look at this  
all the way through the fuel cycle, be-  
ginning at the R&D phase, through  
combustion, through emission.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr.  
Chairman, although this amendment is  
a bit oddly written, it appears to be  
repetitious to the previous Burgess  
amendment, which is repetitious to the  
previous Eshoo amendment.

With that said, in the spirit of civil-  
ity, we accept this amendment.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FERGUSON AS A  
SUBSTITUTE FOR THE AMENDMENT OFFERED  
BY MR. BURGESS

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Chairman, I  
have an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FERGUSON as a  
substitute for the amendment offered by Mr.  
BURGESS:

Page 5, after line 21, insert the following new section:

**SEC. 7. ADDITIONAL ISSUES.**

Research and development under this Act shall address issues with respect to increased volatile emissions or increased nitrogen oxide emissions, and strategies to minimize emissions from infrastructure.

Mr. FERGUSON (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my amendment to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment offered as a substitute for the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. TAUSCHER) having assumed the chair, Mr. TIERNEY, Acting Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 547) to facilitate the development of markets for alternative fuels and Ultra Low Sulfur Diesel fuel through research, development, and demonstration and data collection, pursuant to House Resolution 133, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

PERMISSION TO REDUCE TIME FOR ELECTRONIC VOTING

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during further proceedings today in the House, the Chair be authorized to reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on any question that otherwise could be subjected to a 5-minute vote under clause 8 or 9 of rule XX.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 547.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. TERRY. Madam Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TERRY. Is it correct to state that the standing committees of the House are authorized under rule X of the rules of the House?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct.

□ 1615

Mr. TERRY. Further parliamentary inquiry, Madam Speaker.

And is it also correct that the organization of the standing committees of the House were organized pursuant to previous enacted statutory laws?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. They were ordained by the adoption of the rules on the opening day of this Congress.

Mr. TERRY. I am sorry, Madam Speaker. I could not hear you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The adoption of the standing rules on January 4, 2007, put those committees in place.

Mr. TERRY. Further parliamentary inquiry, Madam Speaker.

Is it also correct that the Committee of the Whole House is provided for under rule XVIII of the standing rules of the House?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. TERRY. And, Madam Speaker, is it true that the Committee of the Whole is not a standing committee of the House?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. TERRY. Further parliamentary inquiry, Madam Speaker.

And is it correct that under rule XVIII, the Committee of the Whole House was not created by statute, but instead comes from previous rules of the House adopted in 1789, modified in 1794, and later adopted by the House in 1880?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Rule XVIII was adopted on opening day of this Congress, as well.

Mr. TERRY. One last parliamentary inquiry, Madam Speaker.

So under the rule adopted by the House last week giving Delegates and Commissioners voting rights, the standing committees of the House and the Committee of the Whole House have the same legal standing under the rules of the House?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is unable to affirm that. Rules X and XVIII have the same provenance.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute adopted by the Committee of the Whole?

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Madam Speaker, I demand a re-vote on the following amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole by those Members of this House duly recognized to vote by the Constitution:

The amendment by Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

The amendment by Mr. WELLER of Illinois.

The amendment by Mr. ROGERS of Michigan.

The amendment by Mr. CANTOR of Virginia.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute?

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, during the Committee of the Whole, I had a parliamentary inquiry of the Chair about a second-degree amendment, and the response from the Chair may not have been accurate.

So in an effort to clarify for the House, in the Committee of the Whole, if a second-order amendment passes but it is not a decisive vote, meaning that the Delegates and the Resident Commissioners weren't decisive in that passing, can any Member call for a re-vote of a second-degree amendment in the full House?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair appreciates the gentleman's inquiring in this forum because an earlier response he received about second-degree amendments in the Committee of the Whole, which should not have been given in that forum in the first place, was incorrect.

Under the regular order, the Chair must put the question in the House on amendments reported from the Committee of the Whole. In the instant case, the Committee of the Whole has reported a single amendment in the nature of a substitute on which the Chair will put the question to the House in due course.

In addition, House Resolution 133 included language to allow any Member to seek a separate vote on any amendment adopted to that original-text substitute in the Committee of the Whole. However, this opportunity for separate votes is not availing either in the case of an amendment rejected in Committee or in the case of an amendment to an amendment to the original-text substitute.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Further parliamentary inquiry, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may state his inquiry.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. So as I understand your answer, Madam Speaker, there is no opportunity for a Member of the House of Representatives to receive a vote in the full House on a second-order amendment from the Committee of the Whole that passed by a nondecisive margin; is that correct?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct.

The Chair will designate the amendments on which a separate vote has been demanded in the order they appear in the text.

The Clerk will designate the first amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HASTINGS of Florida:

Page 3, line 23, insert “The Assistant Administrator is encouraged to utilize Land Grant Institutions, Historically Black Colleges and Universities, Hispanic Serving Institutions, and other minority-serving institutions among other resources to undertake research for this program.” after “point of final sale.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

# RECORDED VOTE

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the previous order of the House, subsequent votes will be reduced to 2 minutes.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 417, noes 0, not voting 17, as follows:

## [Roll No. 87]

### AYES—417

Abercrombie	Carnahan	Feeney
Ackerman	Carney	Ferguson
Aderholt	Carson	Filner
Akin	Carter	Flake
Alexander	Castle	Forbes
Allen	Castor	Fortenberry
Altmire	Chabot	Fossella
Andrews	Chandler	Fox
Arcuri	Clarke	Frank (MA)
Baca	Clay	Franks (AZ)
Bachmann	Cleaver	Frelinghuysen
Bachus	Clyburn	Gallegly
Baird	Coble	Garrett (NJ)
Baker	Cohen	Gerlach
Baldwin	Cole (OK)	Giffords
Barrett (SC)	Conaway	Gilchrest
Barrow	Conyers	Gillibrand
Bartlett (MD)	Cooper	Gillmor
Barton (TX)	Costa	Gingrey
Bean	Costello	Gohmert
Becerra	Courtney	Gonzalez
Berkley	Cramer	Goode
Berman	Crenshaw	Goodlatte
Berry	Crowley	Gordon
Biggert	Cubin	Granger
Bilbray	Cuellar	Graves
Bilirakis	Culberson	Green, Al
Bishop (GA)	Cummings	Green, Gene
Bishop (NY)	Davis (AL)	Grijalva
Bishop (UT)	Davis (CA)	Gutierrez
Blackburn	Davis (IL)	Hall (NY)
Blumenauer	Davis (KY)	Hall (TX)
Blunt	Davis, David	Hare
Boehner	Davis, Lincoln	Harman
Bonner	Davis, Tom	Hastings (FL)
Bono	Deal (GA)	Hayes
Boozman	DeLauro	Heller
Boren	Dent	Hensarling
Boswell	Diaz-Balart, L.	Herger
Boustany	Boyd (FL)	Herseth
Boyd (FL)	Dicks	Higgins
Boyda (KS)	Dingell	Hill
Brady (PA)	Doggett	Hinchey
Brady (TX)	Donnelly	Hinojosa
Braley (IA)	Doolittle	Hirono
Brown (SC)	Doyle	Hobson
Brown, Corrine	Drake	Hodes
Brown-Waite,	Ginny	Hoekstra
Buchanan	Duncan	Holden
Burgess	Edwards	Holt
Burton (IN)	Ehlers	Honda
Butterfield	Ellison	Hooley
Buyer	Ellsworth	Hoyer
Calvert	Emanuel	Hulshof
Camp (MI)	Engel	Hunter
Campbell (CA)	English (PA)	Inglis (SC)
Cannon	Eshoo	Inslee
Cantor	Etheridge	Israel
Capito	Everett	Issa
Capps	Fallin	Jackson (IL)
Capuano	Farr	Jackson-Lee
Cardoza	Fattah	(TX)
		Jefferson

Jindal	Miller (FL)	Schwartz
Johnson (GA)	Miller (MI)	Scott (GA)
Johnson (IL)	Miller (NC)	Scott (VA)
Johnson, E. B.	Miller, Gary	Sensenbrenner
Johnson, Sam	Miller, George	Serrano
Jones (NC)	Mitchell	Sessions
Jones (OH)	Molloy	Sestak
Jordan	Moore (KS)	Shadegg
Kagen	Moore (WI)	Shays
Kanjorski	Moran (KS)	Shea-Porter
Kaptur	Moran (VA)	Sherman
Keller	Murphy (CT)	Shimkus
Kennedy	Murphy, Patrick	Shuler
Kildee	Murphy, Tim	Shuster
Kilpatrick	Murtha	Simpson
Kind	Musgrave	Sires
King (IA)	Myrick	Skelton
King (NY)	Nadler	Slaughter
Kingston	Napolitano	Smith (NE)
Kirk	Neal (MA)	Smith (TX)
Klein (FL)	Neugebauer	Snyder
Kline (MN)	Nunes	Solis
Knollenberg	Oberstar	Souder
Kucinich	Obey	Space
Kuhl (NY)	Olver	Spratt
LaHood	Ortiz	Stark
Lamborn	Pallone	Stearns
Lampson	Pascarella	Stupak
Langevin	Pastor	Sullivan
Lantos	Paul	Sutton
Larsen (WA)	Payne	Tancredo
Larson (CT)	Pearce	Tanner
Latham	Pence	Tauscher
LaTourette	Perlmutter	Taylor
Lee	Peterson (MN)	Terry
Levin	Peterson (PA)	Thompson (CA)
Lewis (CA)	Petri	Thompson (MS)
Lewis (GA)	Pickering	Thornberry
Lewis (KY)	Pitts	Tiahrt
Linder	Platts	Tiberi
Lipinski	Poe	Tierney
LoBiondo	Pomeroy	Towns
Loebach	Porter	Turner
Lofgren, Zoe	Price (GA)	Udall (CO)
Lowe	Price (NC)	Udall (NM)
Lucas	Putnam	Upton
Lungren, Daniel	Rahall	Van Hollen
E.	Ramstad	Velázquez
Lynch	Rangel	Visclosky
Mack	Regula	Walberg
Mahoney (FL)	Rehberg	Walden (OR)
Maloney (NY)	Reichert	Walsh (NY)
Manzullo	Renzi	Walz (MN)
Marchant	Reyes	Wamp
Markley	Royce	Wasserman
Marshall	Rodriguez	Schultz
Matsui	Rogers (AL)	Waters
McCarthy (CA)	Rogers (KY)	Watson
McCarthy (NY)	Rogers (MI)	Watt
McCaul (TX)	Rohrabacher	Waxman
McCollum (MN)	Ros-Lehtinen	Weiner
McCotter	Roskam	Welch (VT)
McCreery	Ross	Weldon (FL)
McGovern	Roybal-Allard	Weller
McHenry	Royce	Westmoreland
McHugh	Ruppersberger	Wexler
McIntyre	Rush	Whitfield
McKeon	Ryan (WI)	Wicker
McMorris	Salazar	Wilson (NM)
Rodgers	Sali	Wilson (OH)
McNerney	Sánchez, Linda	Wilson (SC)
McNulty	T.	Wolf
Meehan	Sanchez, Loretta	Woolsey
Meek (FL)	Sarbanes	Wu
Meeks (NY)	Saxton	Wynn
Melancon	Schakowsky	Yarmuth
Mica	Schiff	Young (AK)
Michaud	Schmidt	Young (FL)

## NOT VOTING—17

Boucher	Hastings (WA)	Pryce (OH)
Davis, Jo Ann	Matheson	Radanovich
DeFazio	McDermott	Rothman
DeGette	Millender-	Ryan (OH)
Emerson	McDonald	Smith (NJ)
Hastert	Norwood	Smith (WA)

□ 1639

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the second amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROGERS of Michigan:

Page 4, line 17, strike “and”.

Page 4, line 18, redesignate paragraph (3) as paragraph (4).

Page 4, after line 17, insert the following new paragraph:

(3) issues with respect to where in the fuel supply chain additives optimally should be added to fuels; and

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 354, nays 58, not voting 22, as follows:

## [Roll No. 88]

### YEAS—354

Aderholt	Clay	Goodlatte
Akin	Cleaver	Gordon
Alexander	Coble	Granger
Allen	Cohen	Graves
Altmire	Cole (OK)	Green, Al
Andrews	Conaway	Grijalva
Arcuri	Cooper	Gutierrez
Baca	Costa	Hall (TX)
Bachmann	Costello	Hare
Bachus	Courtney	Hastings (FL)
Baker	Cramer	Hayes
Baldwin	Crenshaw	Heller
Barrett (SC)	Cubin	Hensarling
Barrow	Cuellar	Herger
Bartlett (MD)	Culberson	Herseth
Barton (TX)	Cummings	Hill
Bean	Davis (AL)	Hobson
Becerra	Davis (CA)	Hodes
Berkley	Davis (IL)	Hoekstra
Berman	Davis (KY)	Holden
Berry	Davis, David	Holt
Biggert	Davis, Lincoln	Hooley
Bilbray	Davis, Tom	Hoyer
Bilirakis	Deal (GA)	Hulshof
Bishop (GA)	DeLauro	Hunter
Bishop (NY)	Dent	Inglis (SC)
Bishop (UT)	Diaz-Balart, L.	Israel
Blackburn	Diaz-Balart, M.	Issa
Blumenauer	Dicks	Jackson (IL)
Blunt	Dingell	Jackson-Lee
Boehner	Bono	(TX)
Bonner	Donnelly	Jefferson
Bono	Doolittle	Jindal
Boozman	Drake	Johnson (GA)
Boren	Dreier	Johnson (IL)
Boswell	Duncan	Johnson, E. B.
Boustany	Edwards	Johnson, Sam
Boyd (FL)	Ehlers	Jones (NC)
Boyda (KS)	Ellison	Jordan
Brady (PA)	Ellsworth	Kagen
Brady (TX)	Emerson	Kanjorski
Braley (IA)	Engel	Kaptur
Brown (SC)	English (PA)	Keller
Brown-Waite,	Etheridge	Kennedy
Brown, Corrine	Everett	Kildee
Buchanan	Fallin	Kilpatrick
Burgess	Fattah	Kind
Burton (IN)	Ferguson	King (IA)
Butterfield	Forbes	King (NY)
Buyer	Fortenberry	Kingston
Camp (MI)	Fossella	Kirk
Campbell (CA)	Fox	Klein (FL)
Cannon	Franks (AZ)	Kline (MN)
Cantor	Frelinghuysen	Knollenberg
Caputo	Gallegly	Kucinich
Cardoza	Garrett (NJ)	Kuhl (NY)
Carnahan	Gerlach	LaHood
Carney	Gilchrest	LaHood
Carson	Gillibrand	Lamborn
Carter	Gillmor	Lampson
Castle	Gingrey	Langevin
Chabot	Gohmert	Lantos
Chandler	Goode	Latham
Clarke		LaTourette

Levin  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (GA)  
Lewis (KY)  
Linder  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Loeb sack  
Lofgren, Zoe  
Lowey  
Lucas  
Lungren, Daniel  
E.  
Lynch  
Mack  
Mahoney (FL)  
Manzullo  
Marchant  
Marshall  
McCarthy (CA)  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCauley (TX)  
McCollum (MN)  
McCotter  
McCrery  
McGovern  
McHenry  
McHugh  
McIntyre  
McKeon  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McNulty  
Meehan  
Meeks (NY)  
Melancon  
Mica  
Michaud  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Miller, Gary  
Mitchell  
Mollohan  
Moore (KS)  
Moore (WI)  
Moran (KS)  
Moran (VA)  
Murphy, Patrick  
Murphy, Tim  
Murtha  
Musgrave  
Myrick  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neugebauer  
Nunes  
Oberstar

#### NAYS—58

Abercrombie  
Ackerman  
Baird  
Blackburn  
Brown, Corrine  
Capps  
Castor  
Clyburn  
Conyers  
Crowley  
Doyle  
Emanuel  
Farr  
Feeney  
Filner  
Flake  
Frank (MA)  
Giffords  
Gonzalez  
Green, Gene

#### NOT VOTING—22

Boucher  
Brady (TX)  
Calvert  
Davis, Jo Ann  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Doggett  
Eshoo

Hall (NY)  
Harman  
Higgins  
Hinchey  
Hirono  
Honda  
Inlee  
Jones (OH)  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lee  
Maloney (NY)  
Markey  
Matsui  
McNerney  
Meek (FL)  
Miller (NC)  
Miller, George  
Murphy (CT)  
Neal (VA)

Shays  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Shimkus  
Shuler  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Sires  
Skelton  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Snyder  
Souder  
Space  
Spratt  
Stearns  
Stupak  
Sullivan  
Tanner  
Tauscher  
Terry  
Thompson (CA)  
Thornberry  
Tiahrt  
Tiberi  
Tierney  
Towns  
Turner  
Udall (NM)  
Upton  
Van Hollen  
Visclosky  
Walberg  
Walden (OR)  
Walsh (NY)  
Walz (MN)  
Wamp  
Waters  
 Waxman  
Weiner  
Weldon (FL)  
Weller  
Westmoreland  
Whitfield  
Wicker  
Wilson (NM)  
Wilson (OH)  
Wilson (SC)  
Wolf  
Woolsey  
Wu  
Wynn  
Yarmuth  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)

Roybal-Allard  
Royce  
Sali  
Sarbanes  
Serrano  
Slaughter  
Solis  
Stark  
Sutton  
Taylor  
Thompson (MS)  
Udall (CO)  
Velázquez  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Watson  
Watt  
Welch (VT)  
Wexler

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the parliamentary inquiry related to this vote?

Mr. WESTMORELAND. It is.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Madam Speaker, could you tell me the reason this vote is being held open and could you read the rule about holding votes open?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is not holding the vote open; the Chair is waiting for the clerks to process changes in the well.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Okay. I didn't realize there would be so much confusion about the way they voted.

Mr. FEENEY. Madam Speaker, further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FEENEY. Madam Speaker, I would like to ask unanimous consent that the Speaker close the board and all Members would have an opportunity to re-vote this issue. It might save a considerable amount of time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk is processing changes of votes in the well. The gentleman's request is not in order.

The Clerk will proceed.

□ 1654

Mr. CROWLEY and Mr. SALI changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Ms. KILPATRICK, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. WATERS and Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon and Messrs. SESTAK, HASTINGS of Florida, BOREN, MCGOVERN, LANGEVIN, PERLMUTTER, COSTA, CARDOZA, SCOTT of Georgia, COURTNEY, PALLONE, COOPER, MEEKS of New York, WYNN, SKELTON, OLVER, ALLEN, LANTOS, BISHOP of New York, JOHNSON of Georgia, CUMMINGS, KAGEN, KIND, Mrs. LOWEY, Messrs. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania, PAYNE, TOWNS, Ms. WOOLSEY and Mr. YARMUTH changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the third amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WELLER of Illinois:

Page 4, line 17, strike "and".

Page 4, line 18, redesignate paragraph (3) as paragraph (4).

Page 4, after line 17, insert the following new paragraph:

(3) issues with respect to certification by a nationally recognized testing laboratory of

components for fuel dispensing devices that specifically reference compatibility with alcohol blended and other biofuels that contain greater than 15 percent alcohol; and

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 385, nays 24, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 89]

#### YEAS—385

Abercrombie	Cooper	Hastings (FL)
Ackerman	Costa	Hayes
Aderholt	Costello	Heller
Akin	Courtney	Hensarling
Alexander	Cramer	Herger
Allen	Crenshaw	Herseth
Altmire	Cubin	Higgins
Andrews	Cuellar	Hill
Arcuri	Culberson	Hirono
Baca	Cummings	Hobson
Bachmann	Davis (AL)	Hodes
Bachus	Davis (CA)	Hoekstra
Baker	Davis (IL)	Holden
Baldwin	Davis (KY)	Holt
Barrett (SC)	Davis, David	Hooley
Barrow	Davis, Lincoln	Hoyer
Bartlett (MD)	Davis, Tom	Hulshof
Barton (TX)	Deal (GA)	Hunter
Bean	Delahunt	Inglis (SC)
Becerra	DeLauro	Inslée
Berkley	Dent	Israel
Berman	Diaz-Balart, L.	Issa
Berry	Diaz-Balart, M.	Jackson-Lee
Biggert	Dicks	(TX)
Bilbray	Donnelly	Jefferson
Billirakis	Doolittle	Jindal
Bishop (GA)	Doyle	Johnson (GA)
Bishop (NY)	Drake	Johnson (IL)
Bishop (UT)	Dreier	Johnson, E. B.
Blackburn	Duncan	Johnson, Sam
Blumenauer	Edwards	Jones (NC)
Blunt	Ehlers	Jones (OH)
Boehner	Ellison	Jordan
Bonner	Ellsworth	Kagen
Bono	Emanuel	Kanjorski
Boozman	Emerson	Kaptur
Boren	Engel	Keller
Boswell	English (PA)	Kennedy
Boustany	Etheridge	Kildee
Boyd (FL)	Everett	Kind
Boyda (KS)	Fallin	King (IA)
Brady (PA)	Farr	King (NY)
Braley (IA)	Fattah	Kingston
Brown (SC)	Feeney	Kirk
Brown, Corrine	Ferguson	Klein (FL)
Brown-Waite,	Flake	Kline (MN)
Ginny	Forbes	Knollenberg
Buchanan	Fortenberry	Kucinich
Burgess	Fossella	Kuhl (NY)
Burton (IN)	Fox	LaHood
Butterfield	Franks (AZ)	Lamborn
Buyer	Frelinghuysen	Lampson
Camp (MI)	Gallely	Langevin
Campbell (CA)	Garrett (NJ)	Lantos
Cannon	Gerlach	Latham
Cantor	Giffords	LaTourette
Capito	Gilchrest	Levin
Capuano	Gillibrand	Lewis (CA)
Cardoza	Gillmor	Lewis (GA)
Carnahan	Gingrey	Lewis (KY)
Carney	Gohmert	Linder
Carson	Goode	Lipinski
Carter	Goodlatte	LoBiondo
Castle	Gordon	Loeb sack
Chabot	Granger	Lofgren, Zoe
Chandler	Graves	Lowey
Clarke	Green, Al	Lucas
Clay	Green, Gene	Lungren, Daniel
Clyburn	Grijalva	E.
Coble	Gutierrez	Lynch
Cohen	Hall (NY)	Mack
Cole (OK)	Hall (TX)	Mahoney (FL)
Conaway	Hare	Maloney (NY)

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised 1 minute remains in this vote.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. WESTMORELAND (during the vote). Madam Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

Manzullo  
Marchant  
Markey  
Marshall  
McCarthy (CA)  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCaul (TX)  
McCollum (MN)  
McCotter  
McCrery  
McGovern  
McHenry  
McHugh  
McIntyre  
McKeon  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McNerney  
McNulty  
Meehan  
Meek (FL)  
Meeks (NY)  
Melancon  
Mica  
Michaud  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Miller (NC)  
Miller, Gary  
Mollohan  
Moore (KS)  
Moore (WI)  
Moran (KS)  
Moran (VA)  
Murphy (CT)  
Murphy, Patrick  
Murphy, Tim  
Murtha  
Musgrave  
Myrick  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal (MA)  
Neugebauer  
Nunes  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Olver  
Ortiz  
Pallone  
Pascrell  
Pastor  
Payne  
Pearce  
Pence  
Perlmutter  
Peterson (MN)  
Peterson (PA)

Petri  
Pickering  
Pitts  
Platts  
Poe  
Pomeroy  
Price (GA)  
Price (NC)  
Putnam  
Rahall  
Ramstad  
Rangel  
Regula  
Rehberg  
Reichert  
Renzi  
Reyes  
Reynolds  
Rodriguez  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross  
Roybal-Allard  
Royce  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (WI)  
Salazar  
Sali  
Sánchez, Linda  
T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Saxton  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schmidt  
Schwartz  
Scott (GA)  
Scott (VA)  
Sensenbrenner  
Serrano  
Sessions  
Sestak  
Shadeegg  
Shays  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Shimkus  
Shuler  
Shuster  
Sires  
Skelton  
Smith (NE)

Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Snyder  
Solis  
Souder  
Space  
Spratt  
Stearns  
Stupak  
Sullivan  
Tanner  
Tauscher  
Taylor  
Terry  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Thornberry  
Tiahrt  
Tiberi  
Tierney  
Towns  
Turner  
Udall (CO)  
Udall (NM)  
Upton  
Van Hollen  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walberg  
Walden (OR)  
Walsh (NY)  
Walz (MN)  
Wamp  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Watson  
Watt  
Waxman  
Weiner  
Welch (VT)  
Weldon (FL)  
Weller  
Westmoreland  
Wexler  
Whitfield  
Wick  
Wilson (NM)  
Wilson (OH)  
Wilson (SC)  
Wolf  
Woolsey  
Wu  
Wynn  
Yarmuth  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)

## NAYS—24

Baird  
Capps  
Castor  
Cleaver  
Conyers  
Crowley  
Dingell  
Filner

Frank (MA)  
Gonzalez  
Harman  
Hinchey  
Honda  
Jackson (IL)  
Kilpatrick  
Larsen (WA)

Larson (CT)  
Lee  
Matsui  
Sarbanes  
Slaughter  
Stark  
Sutton  
Waters

## NOT VOTING—25

Boucher  
Brady (TX)  
Calvert  
Davis, Jo Ann  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Doggett  
Eshoo  
Hastert

Hastings (WA)  
Hinojosa  
Matheson  
McDermott  
Millender-  
McDonald  
Miller, George  
Mitchell  
Norwood

Paul  
Pryce (OH)  
Radanovich  
Rothman  
Ryan (OH)  
Simpson  
Smith (WA)  
Tancred

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised that there is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1700

Mr. MARKEY changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the fourth amend-

ment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CANTOR:

At the end of the bill, insert the following new section:

## SEC. 7. ADDITIONAL FINDING.

The Congress also finds that in order to lessen United States dependence on foreign sources of petroleum, and decrease demand for petroleum in aircraft, such as passenger planes with 42 business class seats capable of transcontinental flights, the Nation must diversify its fuel supply for aircraft to include domestically produced alternative fuels.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. CANTOR. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 385, nays 23, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 90]

YEAS—385

Abercrombie  
Ackerman  
Aderholt  
Akin  
Alexander  
Allen  
Altmire  
Andrews  
Arcuri  
Baca  
Bachmann  
Bachus  
Baker  
Baldwin  
Barrett (SC)  
Barrow  
Bartlett (MD)  
Barton (TX)  
Bean  
Becerra  
Berkley  
Berry  
Biggert  
Bilbray  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (NY)  
Bishop (UT)  
Blackburn  
Blumenauer  
Blunt  
Boehner  
Bonner  
Bono  
Boozman  
Boren  
Boswell  
Boustany  
Boyd (FL)  
Boyd (KS)  
Brady (PA)  
Braley (IA)  
Brown (SC)  
Brown, Corrine  
Brown-Waite,  
Ginny  
Buchanan  
Burgess  
Burton (IN)  
Butterfield  
Buyer  
Camp (MI)  
Campbell (CA)  
Cannon  
Cantor  
Capito  
Capuano  
Cardoza  
Carnahan  
Carney

Carson  
Carter  
Castle  
Chabot  
Chandler  
Clarke  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Coble  
Cohen  
Cole (OK)  
Conaway  
Cooper  
Costa  
Costello  
Courtney  
Cramer  
Crenshaw  
Cubin  
Cuellar  
Culberson  
Cummings  
Davis (AL)  
Davis (CA)  
Davis (IL)  
Davis (KY)  
Davis, David  
Davis, Lincoln  
Davis, Tom  
Deal (GA)  
Delahunt  
DeLauro  
Dent  
Diaz-Balart, L.  
Diaz-Balart, M.  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Donnelly  
Doolittle  
Doyle  
Drake  
Dreier  
Duncan  
Edwards  
Ehlers  
Ellison  
Ellsworth  
Emanuel  
Emerson  
Engel  
English (PA)  
Etheridge  
Everett  
Fallin  
Farr  
Fattah  
Feeney  
Ferguson  
Forbes

Fortenberry  
Fossella  
Foxy  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Gallegly  
Garrett (NJ)  
Gerlach  
Giffords  
Gilchrest  
Gillibrand  
Gillmor  
Gingrey  
Gohmert  
Goode  
Goodlatte  
Gordon  
Granger  
Graves  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Grijalva  
Gutierrez  
Hall (NY)  
Hall (TX)  
Hare  
Hastings (FL)  
Hayes  
Heller  
Hensarling  
Herger  
Herseth  
Higgins  
Hill  
Hirono  
Hobson  
Hodes  
Hoekstra  
Holden  
Holt  
Hooley  
Hoyer  
Hulshof  
Hunter  
Inglis (SC)  
Inslee  
Israel  
Issa  
Jefferson  
Jindal  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson (IL)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones (NC)  
Jones (OH)  
Jordan  
Kagen  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur

Keller  
Kennedy  
Kildee  
Kilpatrick  
Kind  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Kirk  
Klein (FL)  
Kline (MN)  
Knollenberg  
Kuhl (NY)  
Lamborn  
Lampson  
Langevin  
Lantos  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Levin  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (GA)  
Lewis (KY)  
Linder  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Loebuck  
Lofgren, Zoe  
Lowey  
Lucas  
Lungren, Daniel  
E.  
Lynch  
Mack  
Mahoney (FL)  
Maloney (NY)  
Manzullo  
Marchant  
Markey  
Marshall  
McCarthy (CA)  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCaul (TX)  
McCollum (MN)  
McCotter  
McCrery  
McGovern  
McHenry  
McHugh  
McIntyre  
McKeon  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McNerney  
McNulty  
Meehan  
Meek (FL)  
Meeks (NY)  
Melancon  
Mica  
Michaud  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Miller (NC)  
Miller, Gary  
Mollohan  
Moore (KS)  
Moore (WI)  
Moran (KS)

Moran (VA)  
Murphy (CT)  
Murphy, Patrick  
Murphy, Tim  
Murtha  
Musgrave  
Myrick  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal (MA)  
Neugebauer  
Nunes  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Olver  
Ortiz  
Pallone  
Pascrell  
Pastor  
Payne  
Pearce  
Pence  
Perlmutter  
Peterson (PA)  
Petri  
Pickering  
Pitts  
Platts  
Poe  
Pomeroy  
Porter  
Price (GA)  
Price (NC)  
Putnam  
Rahall  
Ramstad  
Rangel  
Regula  
Rehberg  
Reichert  
Renzi  
Reyes  
Reynolds  
Rodriguez  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross  
Roybal-Allard  
Royce  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (WI)  
Salazar  
Sali  
Sánchez, Linda  
T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Saxton  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schmidt  
Schwartz  
Scott (GA)  
Scott (VA)  
Sensenbrenner  
Serrano

Sessions  
Sestak  
Shadeegg  
Shays  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Shimkus  
Shimkus  
Shuler  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Sires  
Skelton  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Snyder  
Solis  
Souder  
Space  
Spratt  
Stark  
Stearns  
Stupak  
Sullivan  
Tanner  
Tauscher  
Taylor  
Terry  
Thompson (MS)  
Thornberry  
Tiahrt  
Tiberi  
Tierney  
Towns  
Turner  
Udall (CO)  
Udall (NM)  
Upton  
Van Hollen  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walberg  
Walden (OR)  
Walsh (NY)  
Walz (MN)  
Wamp  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Watson  
Watt  
Waxman  
Weiner  
Welch (VT)  
Weldon (FL)  
Weller  
Westmoreland  
Wexler  
Whitfield  
Wicker  
Wilson (NM)  
Wilson (OH)  
Wilson (SC)  
Wolf  
Woolsey  
Wu  
Wynn  
Yarmuth  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)

## NAYS—23

Baird  
Capps  
Castor  
Conyers  
Crowley  
Filner  
Flake  
Frank (MA)

Gonzalez  
Hinchey  
Honda  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson-Lee  
(TX)  
Kucinich  
LaHood

Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lee  
Matsui  
Sarbanes  
Slaughter  
Sutton  
Thompson (CA)

## NOT VOTING—26

Berman  
Boucher  
Brady (TX)  
Calvert  
Davis, Jo Ann  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Doggett  
Eshoo

Harman  
Hastert  
Hastings (WA)  
Hinojosa  
Matheson  
McDermott  
Millender-  
McDonald  
Miller, George

Norwood  
Paul  
Peterson (MN)  
Pryce (OH)  
Radanovich  
Rothman  
Ryan (OH)  
Smith (WA)  
Tancred

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised there is 1 minute remaining on this vote.

□ 1707

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. SHIMKUS

Mr. SHIMKUS. Madam Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. SHIMKUS. In its current form, yes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Shimkus moves to recommit the bill H.R. 547 to the Committee on Science and Technology with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendments:

Strike "biofuels" each place it appears and insert "alternative fuels".

Strike "biofuel" each place it appears and insert "alternative fuel".

At the end of the bill, insert the following new section:

#### SEC. 7. DEFINITION.

For purposes of this Act, the term "alternative fuel" has the meaning given that term in section 301 of the Energy Policy Act of 1992.

Page 3, lines 4 and 9, redesignate paragraphs (5) and (6) as paragraphs (6) and (7), respectively.

Page 3, after line 3, insert the following new paragraph:

(5) as the Nation's recoverable coal has the energy content equivalent of one trillion barrels of oil, Ultra Low Sulfur Diesel fuel derived from coal-to-liquid technologies will help lessen our dependence on foreign sources of petroleum;

Page 5, line 3, strike "and" and insert a comma.

Page 5, line 4, insert ", and Ultra Low Sulfur Diesel derived from coal-to-liquids technologies" after "and Low Sulfur Diesel".

Mr. SHIMKUS (during the reading). Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Madam Speaker, last time I spoke on the floor was on H.R. 6, and I challenged my fossil fuel Democrats, my coal Democrats, to not abandon fossil fuels. I know that the majority of the Members of the Democratic

Caucus are anti-coal, but I was assured the interests of coal would not be left out in the future.

Well, here we go again. With this bill we do just that. My motion to recommit would expand the universe of this bill to do what was passed and accepted by a Democratic House in 1992 under EPACT, the Energy and Policy Act.

This bill, as written, does not use the 15-year accepted word of "alternative." By leaving this out, the bill discriminates not only on coal-to-liquid technologies that produce low sulfur diesel and aviation fuel, but also natural gas and hydrogen.

This motion to recommit improves this bill and does not limit science, research and development to not only biofuels but coal-to-liquid, hydrogen and natural gas.

It is my hope that one day the Speaker and all of us will be able to fly back to our districts using aviation fuel produced from coal from U.S. coal mines and U.S. refineries.

And with that, Madam Speaker, I yield to Ranking Member HALL.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Madam Speaker, I will be brief.

In our drive towards energy independence, we cannot exclude one of our greatest natural resources. I am a fossil fuels guy. I am from Texas, and I am for fossil fuels, but I also know the value of coal. Coal must continue to be part of our energy portfolio, along with alternative fuels and renewable fuels.

The Republican motion to recommit recognizes this fact, and I thank you for it. It ensures that coal is going to continue to have a place at the table by clearly defining coal-to-liquids as an alternative fuel and including ultra low sulfur diesel derived from coal-to-liquids in the bill.

The U.S. is in no danger of running out of coal. At current consumption rates, U.S. recoverable coal reserves are estimated to last for 250 years. The U.S. currently has over a quarter of the world's recoverable coal, more than Russia, over twice the amount of China. This compares to the U.S. oil reserves that are 2 percent of the world's total natural gas which are 3 percent of the world's total. We have plenty of coal. Actually, coal reserves are spread also over 38 of your States. Thirty-eight of you there have coal, and it is important to you.

I would just say this. John McKetta, noted author and writer from the University of Texas, said 14 years ago, We have enough coal in the mid-section of the United States to double the total output of the OPEC Nations all combined if we could but mine it.

Let's don't send our kids overseas to take some energy away from someone when we got plenty right here at home.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I want to concur with my

friend from Texas in terms of his concern about coal being a part of the overall package of dealing with energy independence. He is absolutely right, and I think everyone in this body recognizes that clean coal will be a part of our energy independence.

Unfortunately, though, this amendment does not really deal with clean coal. This amendment is a continuing effort to try to undermine this good bill today dealing with alternative energy. This is a very narrow bill.

This is a bill that was cosponsored by myself as chairman of the Science Committee, the ranking member of the Science Committee, and many others, and passed out of the committee unanimously because we are trying to deal with the problem today. We want to deal today with the infrastructure problems that stop our alternative fuels from being able to be used in existing infrastructure.

Clean coal will be a part of a solution later, but clean coal is not available right now. And so why are we stopping dealing with something we can do today for something that there is no solution for today?

Clean coal will be a part of what we do over in the Science and Technology Committee. We have been in discussions about this. I think everybody should know that. So that is off the table.

The question today on this motion to recommit is, do you want to move forward and do something today about alternative energy? If you do, vote down this amendment. If you do not want to do anything about this today, if you want to talk and talk and talk and come back another day, then vote "aye."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

#### RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SHIMKUS. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the earlier order of the House, the Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 200, noes 207, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 91]

AYES—200

Abercrombie	Bilbray	Brown-Waite,
Aderholt	Bilirakis	Ginny
Akin	Bishop (UT)	Buchanan
Alexander	Blackburn	Burgess
Bachmann	Blunt	Burton (IN)
Bachus	Boehner	Buyer
Baker	Bonner	Camp (MI)
Barrett (SC)	Bono	Campbell (CA)
Bartlett (MD)	Boozman	Cannon
Barton (TX)	Boustany	Cantor
Biggert	Brown (SC)	Capito

Carney	Hunter	Porter	McCollum (MN)	Pomeroy	Spratt	Conyers	Israel	Napolitano
Carter	Inglis (SC)	Price (GA)	McGovern	Price (NC)	Stark	Cooper	Issa	Neal (MA)
Castle	Issa	Putnam	McIntyre	Rangel	Stupak	Costa	Jackson (IL)	Neugebauer
Chabot	Jindal	Radanovich	McNerney	Reyes	Sutton	Costello	Jackson-Lee	Nunes
Coble	Johnson (IL)	Rahall	McNulty	Rodriguez	Tanner	Courtney	(TX)	Oberstar
Cole (OK)	Johnson, Sam	Ramstad	Meehan	Ross	Tauscher	Cramer	Jefferson	Obey
Conaway	Jones (NC)	Regula	Meek (FL)	Roybal-Allard	Taylor	Crenshaw	Jindal	Oliver
Costello	Jordan	Rehberg	Meeks (NY)	Ruppersberger	Thompson (CA)	Crowley	Johnson (GA)	Ortiz
Crenshaw	Keller	Reichert	Melancon	Rush	Thompson (MS)	Cubin	Johnson (IL)	Pallone
Cubin	King (IA)	Renzi	Michaud	Salazar	Tierney	Cuellar	Johnson, E. B.	Pascarell
Culberson	King (NY)	Reynolds	Miller (NC)	Sánchez, Linda	Towns	Culberson	Johnson, Sam	Pastor
Davis (KY)	Kingston	Rogers (AL)	Mitchell	T.	Udall (CO)	Cummings	Jones (NC)	Payne
Davis, David	Kirk	Rogers (KY)	Moore (KS)	Sanchez, Loretta	Udall (NM)	Davis (AL)	Jones (OH)	Pearce
Davis, Tom	Kline (MN)	Rogers (MI)	Moore (WI)	Sarbanes	Van Hollen	Davis (CA)	Jordan	Pence
Deal (GA)	Knollenberg	Rohrabacher	Murphy (CT)	Schakowsky	Velázquez	Davis (IL)	Kagen	Perlmutter
Dent	Kuhl (NY)	Ros-Lehtinen	Murphy, Patrick	Schiff	Visclosky	Davis (KY)	Kanjorski	Peterson (MN)
Diaz-Balart, L.	LaHood	Roskam	Murtha	Schwartz	Walz (MN)	Davis, David	Kaptur	Peterson (PA)
Diaz-Balart, M.	Lamborn	Royce	Nadler	Scott (GA)	Wasserman	Davis, Lincoln	Keller	Petri
Doolittle	Latham	Ryan (WI)	Napolitano	Scott (VA)	Schultz	Davis, Tom	Kennedy	Pickering
Drake	LaTourette	Sali	Neal (MA)	Serrano	Waters	Deal (GA)	Kildee	Pitts
Dreier	Lewis (CA)	Saxton	Oberstar	Sestak	Watson	Delahunt	Kilpatrick	Platts
Duncan	Lewis (KY)	Schmidt	Obey	Shays	Watt	DeLauro	Kind	Poe
Ehlers	Linder	Sensenbrenner	Oliver	Shea-Porter	Waxman	Dent	King (IA)	Pomeroy
Emerson	LoBiondo	Sessions	Ortiz	Sherman	Weiner	Diaz-Balart, L.	King (NY)	Porter
English (PA)	Lucas	Shadegg	Pallone	Shuler	Welch (VT)	Diaz-Balart, M.	Kingston	Price (GA)
Everett	Lungren, Daniel	Shimkus	Pascarell	Sires	Wexler	Dicks	Kirk	Price (NC)
Fallin	E.	Shuster	Pastor	Skelton	Woolsey	Dingell	Klein (FL)	Putnam
Feeney	Mack	Simpson	Payne	Slaughter	Wu	Donnelly	Kline (MN)	Radanovich
Ferguson	Manzullo	Smith (NE)	Perlmutter	Snyder	Wynn	Doolittle	Knollenberg	Rahall
Flake	Marchant	Smith (NJ)	Peterson (MN)	Solis	Yarmuth	Doyle	Kucinich	Ramstad
Forbes	McCarthy (CA)	Smith (TX)				Drake	Kuhl (NY)	Rangel
Fortenberry	McCaul (TX)	Souder				Duncan	LaHood	Regula
Fossella	McCotter	Space	Berman	Harman	Moran (VA)	Edwards	Lamborn	Rehberg
Fox	McCrery	Stearns	Boucher	Hastert	Norwood	Ehlers	Lampson	Reichert
Franks (AZ)	McHenry	Sullivan	Brady (TX)	Hastings (WA)	Paul	Ellison	Langevin	Renzi
Frelinghuysen	McHugh	Terry	Calvert	Hinojosa	Pryce (OH)	Ellsworth	Lantos	Reyes
Gallely	McMorris	Thornberry	Davis, Jo Ann	Matheson	Rothman	Emanuel	Larsen (WA)	Reynolds
Garrett (NJ)	Rodgers	Tiahrt	DeFazio	McDermott	Ryan (OH)	Emerson	Larson (CT)	Rodriguez
Gerlach	Mica	Tiberi	DeGette	McKeon	Smith (VA)	Engel	Latham	Rogers (AL)
Gilchrest	Miller (FL)	Turner	DeLauro	Millender-	Tancredo	English (PA)	LaTourette	Rogers (KY)
Gillmor	Miller (MI)	Upton	Doggett	McDonald		Etheridge	Lee	Rogers (MI)
Gingrey	Miller, Gary	Walberg	Eshoo	Miller, George		Everett	Levin	Rohrabacher
Gohmert	Mollohan	Walden (OR)				Fallin	Lewis (CA)	Ros-Lehtinen
Goode	Moran (KS)	Walsh (NY)				Farr	Lewis (GA)	Roskam
Goodlatte	Murphy, Tim	Wamp				Fattah	Lewis (KY)	Ross
Granger	Musgrave	Weldon (FL)				Feeney	Linder	Roybal-Allard
Graves	Myrick	Weller				Ferguson	Lipinski	Royce
Hall (TX)	Neugebauer	Westmoreland				Filner	LoBiondo	Ruppersberger
Hayes	Nunes	Whitfield				Forbes	Loeb sack	Rush
Heller	Pearce	Wicker				Fortenberry	Lofgren, Zoe	Ryan (WI)
Hensarling	Pence	Wilson (NM)				Fossella	Lowey	Salazar
Herger	Peterson (PA)	Wilson (OH)				Fox	Lucas	Sali
Hill	Pickering	Wilson (SC)				Frank (MA)	Lungren, Daniel	Sanchez, Loretta
Hobson	Pitts	Wolf				Franks (AZ)	E.	Sarbanes
Hoekstra	Platts	Young (AK)				Frelinghuysen	Lynch	Saxton
Holden	Poe	Young (FL)				Gallely	Mack	Schakowsky
Hulshof						Garrett (NJ)	Mahoney (FL)	Schiff

## NOES—207

Ackerman	Cramer	Honda
Allen	Crowley	Hooley
Altmire	Cuellar	Hoyer
Andrews	Cummings	Inslee
Arcuri	Davis (AL)	Israel
Baca	Davis (CA)	Jackson (IL)
Baird	Davis (IL)	Jackson-Lee
Baldwin	Davis, Lincoln	(TX)
Barrow	Delahunt	Jefferson
Bean	Dicks	Johnson (GA)
Becerra	Dingell	Johnson, E. B.
Berkley	Donnelly	Jones (OH)
Berry	Doyle	Kagen
Bishop (GA)	Edwards	Kanjorski
Bishop (NY)	Ellison	Kaptur
Blumenauer	Ellsworth	Kennedy
Boren	Emanuel	Kildee
Boswell	Engel	Kilpatrick
Boyd (FL)	Etheridge	Kind
Boyd (KS)	Farr	Klein (FL)
Brady (PA)	Fattah	Kucinich
Braley (IA)	Filner	Lampson
Brown, Corrine	Frank (MA)	Langevin
Butterfield	Giffords	Lantos
Capps	Gillibrand	Larsen (WA)
Capuano	Gonzalez	Larson (CT)
Cardoza	Gordon	Lee
Carnahan	Green, Al	Levin
Carson	Green, Gene	Lewis (GA)
Castor	Grijalva	Lipinski
Chandler	Gutierrez	Loeb sack
Clarke	Hall (NY)	Lofgren, Zoe
Clay	Hare	Lowey
Cleaver	Hastings (FL)	Lynch
Clyburn	Herse <td>Mahoney (FL)</td>	Mahoney (FL)
Cohen	Higgins	Maloney (NY)
Conyers	Hinchey	Markey
Cooper	Hirono	Marshall
Costa	Hodes	Matsui
Courtney	Holt	McCarthy (NY)

## NOT VOTING—27

Berman	Harman	Moran (VA)
Boucher	Hastert	Norwood
Brady (TX)	Hastings (WA)	Paul
Calvert	Hinojosa	Pryce (OH)
Davis, Jo Ann	Matheson	Rothman
DeFazio	McDermott	Ryan (OH)
DeGette	McKeon	Smith (VA)
DeLauro	Millender-	Tancredo
Doggett	McDonald	
Eshoo	Miller, George	

□ 1732

Mr. WILSON of Ohio and Mr. HILL changed their vote from “no” to “aye.” So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

## RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SHIMKUS. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 400, noes 3, not voting 31, as follows:

[Roll No. 92]

## AYES—400

Abercrombie	Bilirakis	Buyer
Ackerman	Bishop (GA)	Camp (MI)
Aderholt	Bishop (UT)	Campbell (CA)
Akin	Blackburn	Cannon
Alexander	Blumenauer	Cantor
Allen	Blunt	Capito
Altmire	Boehner	Capps
Andrews	Bonner	Capuano
Arcuri	Bono	Cardoza
Baca	Boozman	Carnahan
Bachmann	Boren	Carney
Bachus	Boswell	Carson
Baird	Boustany	Carter
Baker	Boyd (FL)	Castle
Baldwin	Boyd (KS)	Castor
Barrett (SC)	Brady (PA)	Chabot
Barrow	Braley (IA)	Chandler
Bartlett (MD)	Brown (SC)	Clarke
Barton (TX)	Brown, Corrine	Clay
Bean	Brown-Waite,	Cleaver
Becerra	Ginny	Clyburn
Berkley	Buchanan	Coble
Berry	Burgess	Cohen
Biggart	Burton (IN)	Cole (OK)
Bilbray	Butterfield	Conaway

Udall (CO)	Waters	Wilson (OH)
Udall (NM)	Watson	Wilson (SC)
Upton	Watt	Wolf
Velázquez	Waxman	Woolsey
Visclosky	Weiner	Wu
Walberg	Welch (VT)	Wynn
Walden (OR)	Weldon (FL)	Yarmuth
Walsh (NY)	Weller	Young (AK)
Walz (MN)	Westmoreland	Young (FL)
Wamp	Wexler	
Wasserman	Whitfield	
Schultz	Wicker	

## NOES—3

Flake	Shadegg	Shimkus
-------	---------	---------

## NOT VOTING—31

Berman	Harman	Norwood
Bishop (NY)	Hastert	Paul
Boucher	Hastings (WA)	Pryce (OH)
Brady (TX)	Hinojosa	Rothman
Calvert	Matheson	Ryan (OH)
Davis, Jo Ann	McDermott	Sánchez, Linda
DeFazio	McKeon	T.
DeGette	Millender-	Smith (WA)
Doggett	McDonald	Tancredo
Dreier	Miller, Gary	Van Hollen
Eshoo	Miller, George	Wilson (NM)

□ 1739

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "To facilitate the development of markets for biofuels and Ultra Low Sulfur Diesel fuel through research and development and data collection."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. BLUNT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of inquiring about next week's schedule, and I yield to my good friend, the gentleman from Maryland, the majority leader, Mr. HOYER.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Republican whip for yielding.

On Monday the House will meet at 12:30 for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. We will consider several bills under suspension of the rules. There will be no votes before 6:30 p.m. as is our practice.

On Tuesday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for morning hour, and at 10 a.m. for legislative business. On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m., and on Friday the House will meet at 9 a.m.

In addition to further suspension bills, a complete list of those bills for the week will be announced later this week, we will consider a small business tax relief bill, and a resolution regarding the war in Iraq.

Because we intend to make sure that every Member who wishes to speak to that matter will have the opportunity to do so, Members should be advised that we will have long days next week, meaning perhaps as late as midnight, and Friday could be a full day in order to complete our work for the week.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for that information. I would like to yield again to him to ask when on our side we might be able to see the

resolution in its completed form, or in any form for that matter.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, we have told our Members that by Monday morning at 10 a.m. we ought to have that resolution available.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, I would also ask, will we see that resolution go through the Armed Services Committee and be marked up there? Or what will be the process for the resolution? I yield.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. There have been, I would tell the gentleman, some 22 hearings on Iraq by the Government Reform Committee, by the Armed Services Committee, by the International Relations Committee, by the Appropriations subcommittee and by the Committee on Intelligence. There have been extensive hearings on this bill. This is a resolution. It is being done in conjunction with the Armed Service Committee and the International Relations Committee. I do not anticipate that there will be a markup of the resolution.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the information. This resolution I guess we have never had a hearing on. But the resolution is going to be put before the body by the leaders. Is that what you anticipate happening, Mr. Leader?

Mr. HOYER. That is what I anticipate, the leaders being Mr. SKELTON, Mr. LANTOS, and others. We expect there to be Members on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, another question: What about the Republican leaders and Members? Will we have a chance to have amendments to this bill? Will we get a chance to have a substitute? Will there be more than one substitute? What kinds of things are you thinking about in terms of the structure of the debate?

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, we believe that the issue of the President's policy, which was announced some weeks ago, is an extraordinarily serious question confronting the country and the Congress. We expect the resolution to be very straightforward and very simple.

We expect the resolution to deal only with the proposal the President has made for escalation. We believe we should present that to the House of Representatives as an issue on which they can make their advice to the President of the United States and to the Executive Department.

So the answer to the gentleman's question is that we do not believe, as you have not in the past on similar resolutions, I remember your so-called Murtha resolution, we believe that there will be a direct question propounded to the House which every Member can speak to for 3 to 4 days, and then give their advice on.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, would we have at least the opportunity for a recommitment with instructions? At one time I thought you had announced the likelihood that we would have a sub-

stitute on Tuesday of this week or sometime earlier this week. Am I hearing now you do not any longer believe we will have that, and will we at least have the recommitment opportunity?

Mr. HOYER. We are grappling with this, I will tell my friend. We believe the American public, the American people, have the right to know where their representatives stand on the central and sole issue that the resolution will raise.

There may be other issues that you might want to raise at some point in time. And there are going to be at least three pieces of legislation, as you know, that will be coming down the pike on this issue: the supplemental, the authorization bill, and the appropriation bill for 2008.

We expect all of those bills to be relatively broad in their treatment of various different aspects. But I will tell the gentleman, frankly, because we feel this is such a critically important question and that the clarity of the question and the clarity of the response is so important that we are trying to carefully consider how we can assure that there is no confusion as to the answer that this House gives.

Mr. BLUNT. Of course, I hope that as you grapple with this, you will grapple toward the determination of input into this important debate. I believe, as you do, it is a critically important debate. This is an important issue. You and I have been together to Iraq twice. We both have taken this issue very seriously. We watched and the American people have watched the debate on the other side of this building this week, where the whole process has come to a halt because of the unwillingness of that body to move forward without having options on the table; and even in that debate, the majority offered at least one alternative opportunity to the minority.

And that was not acceptable to that minority on that side of the building. I would hope on this side of the building that at least we would get the offer that if you are working on the other side of the building, you walked away from, which would be one opportunity to express another view.

We are going to have 3 full days of debate. The gentleman said some of them could very well last as long as midnight.

□ 1745

That is enough time to consider more than one point of view and have at least two points of view heard. And I heard the gentleman early in the week; I heard him say today, you are still grappling with that. And I would just encourage you to do your best to try to create the opportunity for this issue to be debated in the fullest possible way at this moment and move on with that.

I would also like to ask, with February 15 being the last day for the current continuing resolution to be in effect, it seems to me possible at least that the Senate is not going to deal

with the bill by the end of the week. Do we have any plans as to how to deal with that issue? Or do you have any information that I don't have that would suggest that it is likely that the Senate will have agreed to a bill that we can agree to?

One option, obviously, would be agree to the bill that the House sent over. But I am interested in what happens on Friday, and between now and Friday that might settle that also, that important issue as well.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. I thank my friend for yielding.

The gentleman is correct. On February 15, of course, the existing CR expires in terms of authorization for the funding of the departments that were unfunded in the budget cycle, in the appropriation cycle, so that we need to take action to keep the government operating for all agencies other than Homeland Security and the Defense Department.

We are trying to plan on the contingencies. Obviously, one of the alternatives you mentioned is one that we would hope might be followed, and that is the adoption of the House-passed CR, which we think is one that obviously a broad number of this House supported in a bipartisan fashion. We would hope that the other body would.

But if they do not move ahead, we are discussing the possibility of some short-term CR. But those discussions have not moved beyond the contemplation that they may be necessary. They have not come to any decision as to how long it would be.

Clearly, one of the problems, as the gentleman knows, is we are leaving for a week for the Presidents' Day District Work Period, so that we would not be here at least for the following week. One of the reasons obviously Friday may be a very long day will be because the CR will have expired if we don't pass something, and we may have to deal with it that day, as well as ending the debate that we referred to previously.

Mr. BLUNT. I thank the gentleman for that information.

I would assume that fairly early in the week, it is likely, it is possible, at least, that having to deal with that CR question will appear to be likely rather than not. I will be glad to join with you in watching that closely early in the week. We look forward to the debate.

Mr. HOYER. Will my friend yield?

Mr. BLUNT. I would.

Mr. HOYER. I don't want to get into a long debate, but I do want to make an observation.

Mr. DREIER was critical that we put today's bill on the floor, and he indicated he thought it would take just a few minutes to pass and that everybody would be for it. The Members were hoping that would be the case. But you never can tell.

Mr. BLUNT. I appreciate those comments. And, of course, after the 6 weeks that we have had of no oppor-

tunity to express our views, we were eager to express those, and we were grateful for the open rule. And, frankly, we were able to, I think, bring some good debate to the floor.

The re-voting issue surprised me because when we re-voted those amendments that had been passed in the House, on one amendment, 57 people changed their mind between the vote and the re-vote. And on another one, 25 people changed their mind. I had always assumed there was more consistency in the voting than that, but I guess 30 minutes can make a big difference in how that goes.

Mr. HOYER. If the gentleman will yield.

Mr. BLUNT. I would yield.

Mr. HOYER. I think the expression you saw was not on the merits of the amendments.

Mr. BLUNT. That very well could be. I am sure that those Members will be able to explain that fully in that way.

I thank the gentleman for the information.

—  
**—**  
 HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW, ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 2007, HOUR OF MEETING ON TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 13, 2007, AND HOUR OF MEETING ON FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 2007

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 2 p.m. tomorrow; that when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Monday next for morning hour debate; that when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. on Tuesday, February 13, 2007, for morning hour debate as though after May 14, 2007, thereafter to resume its session at 10 a.m.; and further, when the House adjourns on Thursday, February 15, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. on Friday, February 16.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BERRY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

—  
**—**  
 DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

#### ENERGY SECURITY

(Mr. SCHIFF asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Speaker, on Friday, the Intergovernmental Panel on

Climate Change released its fourth report on the state of climate change science. This report is the most comprehensive, unbiased summary of the climate situation because it evaluates all peer-reviewed research published around the world and draws only the most conservative conclusions.

The report found that the evidence of global warming is unequivocal, and that the culprit is almost certainly our emissions.

However, this troubling scientific consensus is not acceptable to some, like the American Enterprise Institute, which sent a letter to climate scientists offering them \$10,000 to write articles challenging the IPCC's analysis. This is an appalling attempt by vested interests to buy science that is more convenient for their outdated philosophy. However, it is also encouraging because it demonstrates just how desperate the climate skeptics are.

The IPCC report is the writing on the wall. The American people are demanding comprehensive climate change legislation, and we can delay no longer.

#### HYPOTHETICAL QUESTION

(Mr. GOHMERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, growing up, high school, college, even in the Army, law school, people were always coming up with these brain twister questions they want you to think about.

And as I sat here today thinking through the debates going back and forth, I had a question that I thought might be good to ask. If a luxury jet liner is flying, taking off from Washington, D.C., and flying nonstop to San Francisco with one passenger and 16 crew members, and they land in San Francisco with the one passenger, the Speaker, and then, instead of stopping, they refuel and take off nonstop for American Samoa, at what point, if any, during the flight do any of the crew members fall under the minimum wage requirements of the Federal Government?

Interesting question.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. SHEA-PORTER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

#### PUBLICATION OF THE RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES, 110TH CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RAHALL. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to submit for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pursuant to rule XI, clause

2(a) of the Rules of the House, a copy of the Rules of the Committee on Natural Resources, which were adopted at the organizational meeting of the committee on February 7, 2007.

RULES FOR THE COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, 110TH CONGRESS

#### RULE 1. RULES OF THE HOUSE; VICE CHAIRMEN.

##### (a) Applicability of House Rules.

(1) The Rules of the House of Representatives, so far as they are applicable, are the rules of the Committee and its Subcommittees.

(2) Each Subcommittee is part of the Committee and is subject to the authority, direction and rules of the Committee. References in these rules to "Committee" and "Chairman" shall apply to each Subcommittee and its Chairman wherever applicable.

(3) House Rule XI is incorporated and made a part of the rules of the Committee to the extent applicable.

(b) Vice Chairmen.—Unless inconsistent with other rules, the Chairman shall appoint a Vice Chairman of the Committee and the Subcommittee Chairmen will appoint Vice Chairmen of each of the Subcommittees. If the Chairman of the Committee or Subcommittee is not present at any meeting of the Committee or Subcommittee, as the case may be, the Vice Chairman shall preside. If the Vice Chairman is not present, the ranking Member of the Majority party on the Committee or Subcommittee who is present shall preside at that meeting.

#### RULE 2. MEETINGS IN GENERAL.

(a) Scheduled Meetings.—The Committee shall meet at 10 a.m. every Wednesday when the House is in session, unless canceled by the Chairman. The Committee shall also meet at the call of the Chairman subject to advance notice to all Members of the Committee. Special meetings shall be called and convened by the Chairman as provided in clause 2(c)(1) of House Rule XI. Any Committee meeting or hearing that conflicts with a party caucus, conference, or similar party meeting shall be rescheduled at the discretion of the Chairman, in consultation with the Ranking Minority Member. The Committee may not sit during a joint session of the House and Senate or during a recess when a joint meeting of the House and Senate is in progress.

(b) Open Meetings.—Each meeting for the transaction of business, including the markup of legislation, and each hearing of the Committee or a Subcommittee shall be open to the public, except as provided by clause 2(g) and clause 2(k) of House Rule XI.

(c) Broadcasting.—Whenever a meeting for the transaction of business, including the markup of legislation, or a hearing is open to the public, that meeting or hearing shall be open to coverage by television, radio, and still photography in accordance with clause 4 of House Rule XI. The provisions of clause 4(f) of House Rule XI are specifically made part of these rules by reference. Operation and use of any Committee Internet broadcast system shall be fair and nonpartisan and in accordance with clause 4(b) of House Rule XI and all other applicable rules of the Committee and the House.

(d) Oversight Plan.—No later than February 15 of the first session of each Congress, the Committee shall adopt its oversight plans for that Congress in accordance with clause 2(d)(1) of House Rule X.

#### RULE 3. PROCEDURES IN GENERAL.

(a) Agenda of Meetings; Information for Members.—An agenda of the business to be considered at meetings shall be delivered to the office of each Member of the Committee

no later than 48 hours before the meeting. This requirement may be waived by a majority vote of the Committee at the time of the consideration of the measure or matter. To the extent practicable, a summary of the major provisions of any bill being considered by the Committee, including the need for the bill and its effect on current law, will be available for the Members of the Committee no later than 48 hours before the meeting.

(b) Meetings and Hearings to Begin Promptly.—Each meeting or hearing of the Committee shall begin promptly at the time stipulated in the public announcement of the meeting or hearing.

(c) Addressing the Committee.—A Committee Member may address the Committee or a Subcommittee on any bill, motion, or other matter under consideration or may question a witness at a hearing only when recognized by the Chairman for that purpose. The time a Member may address the Committee or Subcommittee for any purpose or to question a witness shall be limited to five minutes, except as provided in Committee Rule 4(g). A Member shall limit his remarks to the subject matter under consideration. The Chairman shall enforce the preceding provision.

##### (d) Quorums.

(1) A majority of the Members shall constitute a quorum for the reporting of any measure or recommendation, the authorizing of a subpoena, the closing of any meeting or hearing to the public under clause 2(g)(1), clause 2(g)(2)(A) and clause 2(k)(5)(B) of House Rule XI, and the releasing of executive session materials under clause 2(k)(7) of House Rule X. Testimony and evidence may be received at any hearing at which there are at least two Members of the Committee present. For the purpose of transacting all other business of the Committee, one third of the Members shall constitute a quorum.

(2) When a call of the roll is required to ascertain the presence of a quorum, the offices of all Members shall be notified and the Members shall have not less than 15 minutes to prove their attendance. The Chairman shall have the discretion to waive this requirement when a quorum is actually present or whenever a quorum is secured and may direct the Chief Clerk to note the names of all Members present within the 15-minute period.

(e) Participation of Members in Committee and Subcommittees.—All Members of the Committee may sit with any Subcommittee during any hearing, and by unanimous consent of the Members of the Subcommittee may participate in any meeting or hearing. However, a Member who is not a Member of the Subcommittee may not vote on any matter before the Subcommittee; be counted for purposes of establishing a quorum or raise points of order.

(f) Proxies.—No vote in the Committee or its Subcommittees may be cast by proxy.

(g) Record Votes.—Record votes shall be ordered on the demand of one-fifth of the Members present, or by any Member in the apparent absence of a quorum.

##### (h) Postponed Record Votes.

(1) Subject to paragraph (2), the Chairman may, after consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, postpone further proceedings when a record vote is ordered on the question of approving any measure or matter or adopting an amendment. The Chairman shall resume proceedings on a postponed request at any time after reasonable notice, but no later than the next meeting day.

(2) Notwithstanding any intervening order for the previous question, when proceedings resume on a postponed question under paragraph (1), an underlying proposition shall remain subject to further debate or amendment to the same extent as when the question was postponed.

(3) This rule shall apply to Subcommittee proceedings.

(i) Privileged Motions.—A motion to recess from day to day, a motion to recess subject to the call of the Chairman (within 24 hours), and a motion to dispense with the first reading (in full) of a bill or resolution if printed copies are available, are nondebatable motions of high privilege.

(j) Layover and Copy of Bill.—No measure or recommendation reported by a Subcommittee shall be considered by the Committee until two calendar days from the time of Subcommittee action. No bill shall be considered by the Committee unless a copy has been delivered to the office of each Member of the Committee requesting a copy. These requirements may be waived by a majority vote of the Committee at the time of consideration of the measure or recommendation.

(k) Access to Dais and Conference Room.—Access to the hearing rooms' daises [and to the conference rooms adjacent to the Committee hearing rooms] shall be limited to Members of Congress and employees of the Committee during a meeting of the Committee, except that Committee Members' personal staff may be present on the daises if their employing Member is the author of a bill or amendment under consideration by the Committee, but only during the time that the bill or amendment is under active consideration by the Committee. Access to the conference rooms adjacent to the Committee hearing rooms shall be limited to Members of Congress and employees of Congress during a meeting of the Committee.

(l) Cellular Telephones.—The use of cellular telephones is prohibited on the Committee dais or in the Committee hearing rooms during a meeting of the Committee.

(m) Motion to go to Conference with the Senate.—The Chairman may offer a motion under clause 1 of Rule XXII whenever the Chairman considers it appropriate.

#### RULE 4. HEARING PROCEDURES.

(a) Announcement.—The Chairman shall publicly announce the date, place, and subject matter of any hearing at least one week before the hearing unless the Chairman, with the concurrence of the Ranking Minority Member, determines that there is good cause to begin the hearing sooner, or if the Committee so determines by majority vote. In these cases, the Chairman shall publicly announce the hearing at the earliest possible date. The Chief Clerk of the Committee shall promptly notify the Daily Digest Clerk of the Congressional Record and shall promptly enter the appropriate information on the Committee's web site as soon as possible after the public announcement is made.

(b) Written Statement; Oral Testimony.—Each witness who is to appear before the Committee or a Subcommittee shall file with the Chief Clerk of the Committee or Subcommittee Clerk, at least two working days before the day of his or her appearance, a written statement of proposed testimony. Failure to comply with this requirement may result in the exclusion of the written testimony from the hearing record and/or the barring of an oral presentation of the testimony. Each witness shall limit his or her oral presentation to a five-minute summary of the written statement, unless the Chairman, in consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, extends this time period. In addition, all witnesses shall be required to submit with their testimony a resume or other statement describing their education, employment, professional affiliations and other background information pertinent to their testimony.

(c) Minority Witnesses.—When any hearing is conducted by the Committee or any Subcommittee upon any measure or matter, the

Minority party Members on the Committee or Subcommittee shall be entitled, upon request to the Chairman by a majority of those Minority Members before the completion of the hearing, to call witnesses selected by the Minority to testify with respect to that measure or matter during at least one day of hearings thereon.

(d) Information for Members.—After announcement of a hearing, the Committee shall make available as soon as practicable to all Members of the Committee a tentative witness list and to the extent practicable a memorandum explaining the subject matter of the hearing (including relevant legislative reports and other necessary material). In addition, the Chairman shall make available to the Members of the Committee any official reports from departments and agencies on the subject matter as they are received.

(e) Subpoenas.—The Committee or a Subcommittee may authorize and issue a subpoena under clause 2(m) of House Rule XI if authorized by a majority of the Members voting. In addition, the Chairman of the Committee may authorize and issue subpoenas during any period of time in which the House of Representatives has adjourned for more than three days. Subpoenas shall be signed only by the Chairman of the Committee, or any Member of the Committee authorized by the Committee, and may be served by any person designated by the Chairman or Member.

(f) Oaths.—The Chairman of the Committee or any Member designated by the Chairman may administer oaths to any witness before the Committee. All witnesses appearing in hearings may be administered the following oath by the Chairman or his designee prior to receiving the testimony: "Do you solemnly swear or affirm that the testimony that you are about to give is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?"

(g) Opening Statements; Questioning of Witnesses.

(1) Opening statements by Members may not be presented orally, unless the Chairman or his designee makes a statement, in which case the Ranking Minority Member or his designee may also make a statement. If a witness scheduled to testify at any hearing of the Committee is a constituent of a Member of the Committee, that Member shall be entitled to introduce the witness at the hearing.

(2) The questioning of witnesses in Committee and Subcommittee hearings shall be initiated by the Chairman, followed by the Ranking Minority Member and all other Members alternating between the Majority and Minority parties. In recognizing Members to question witnesses, the Chairman shall take into consideration the ratio of the Majority to Minority Members present and shall establish the order of recognition for questioning in a manner so as not to disadvantage the Members of the Majority or the Members of the Minority. A motion is in order to allow designated Majority and Minority party Members to question a witness for a specified period to be equally divided between the Majority and Minority parties. This period shall not exceed one hour in the aggregate.

(h) Materials for Hearing Record.—Any materials submitted specifically for inclusion in the hearing record must address the announced subject matter of the hearing and be submitted to the relevant Subcommittee Clerk or Chief Clerk no later than 10 business days following the last day of the hearing.

(i) Claims of Privilege.—Claims of common-law privileges made by witnesses in hearings, or by interviewees or deponents in investigations or inquiries, are applicable

only at the discretion of the Chairman, subject to appeal to the Committee.

#### RULE 5. FILING OF COMMITTEE REPORTS.

(a) Duty of Chairman.—Whenever the Committee authorizes the favorable reporting of a measure from the Committee, the Chairman or his designee shall report the same to the House of Representatives and shall take all steps necessary to secure its passage without any additional authority needing to be set forth in the motion to report each individual measure. In appropriate cases, the authority set forth in this rule shall extend to moving in accordance with the Rules of the House of Representatives that the House be resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the measure; and to moving in accordance with the Rules of the House of Representatives for the disposition of a Senate measure that is substantially the same as the House measure as reported.

(b) Filing.—A report on a measure which has been approved by the Committee shall be filed within seven calendar days (exclusive of days on which the House of Representatives is not in session) after the day on which there has been filed with the Committee Chief Clerk a written request, signed by a majority of the Members of the Committee, for the reporting of that measure. Upon the filing with the Committee Chief Clerk of this request, the Chief Clerk shall transmit immediately to the Chairman notice of the filing of that request.

(c) Supplemental, Additional or Minority Views.—Any Member may, if notice is given at the time a bill or resolution is approved by the Committee, file supplemental, additional, or minority views. These views must be in writing and signed by each Member joining therein and be filed with the Committee Chief Clerk not less than two additional calendar days (excluding Saturdays, Sundays and legal holidays except when the House is in session on those days) of the time the bill or resolution is approved by the Committee. This paragraph shall not preclude the filing of any supplemental report on any bill or resolution that may be required for the correction of any technical error in a previous report made by the Committee on that bill or resolution.

(d) Review by Members.—Each Member of the Committee shall be given an opportunity to review each proposed Committee report before it is filed with the Clerk of the House of Representatives. Nothing in this paragraph extends the time allowed for filing supplemental, additional or minority views under paragraph (c).

(e) Disclaimer.—All Committee or Subcommittee reports printed and not approved by a majority vote of the Committee or Subcommittee, as appropriate, shall contain the following disclaimer on the cover of the report:

"This report has not been officially adopted by the (Committee on Natural Resources) (Subcommittee) and may not therefore necessarily reflect the views of its Members."

#### RULE 6. ESTABLISHMENT OF SUBCOMMITTEES; FULL COMMITTEE JURISDICTION; BILL REFERRALS.

(a) Subcommittees.—There shall be five standing Subcommittees of the Committee, with the following jurisdiction and responsibilities:

##### *Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests and Public Lands*

(1) Measures and matters related to the National Park System and its units, including Federal reserved water rights.

(2) The National Wilderness Preservation System.

(3) Wild and Scenic Rivers System, National Trails System, national heritage areas

and other national units established for protection, conservation, preservation or recreational development, other than coastal barriers.

(4) Military parks and battlefields, national cemeteries administered by the Secretary of the Interior, parks in and within the vicinity of the District of Columbia and the erection of monuments to the memory of individuals.

(5) Federal outdoor recreation plans, programs and administration including the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

(6) Plans and programs concerning non-Federal outdoor recreation and land use, including related plans and programs authorized by the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 and the Outdoor Recreation Act of 1963.

(7) Preservation of prehistoric ruins and objects of interest on the public domain and other historic preservation programs and activities, including national monuments, historic sites and programs for international cooperation in the field of historic preservation.

(8) Matters concerning the following agencies and programs: Urban Parks and Recreation Recovery Program, Historic American Buildings Survey, Historic American Engineering Record, and U.S. Holocaust Memorial.

(9) Public lands generally, including measures or matters relating to entry, easements, withdrawals, grazing and Federal reserved water rights.

(10) Forfeiture of land grants and alien ownership, including alien ownership of mineral lands.

(11) Cooperative efforts to encourage, enhance and improve international programs for the protection of the environment and the conservation of natural resources otherwise within the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee.

(12) Forest reservations, including management thereof, created from the public domain.

(13) Public forest lands generally, including measures or matters related to entry, easements, withdrawals, grazing and Federal reserved water rights.

(14) General and continuing oversight and investigative authority over activities, policies and programs within the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee.

##### *Subcommittee on Fisheries, Wildlife and Oceans*

(1) Fisheries management and fisheries research generally, including the management of all commercial and recreational fisheries, the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act, interjurisdictional fisheries, international fisheries agreements, aquaculture, seafood safety and fisheries promotion.

(2) Wildlife resources, including research, restoration, refuges and conservation.

(3) All matters pertaining to the protection of coastal and marine environments, including estuarine protection.

(4) Coastal barriers.

(5) Oceanography.

(6) Ocean engineering, including materials, technology and systems.

(7) Coastal zone management.

(8) Marine sanctuaries.

(9) U.N. Convention on the Law of the Sea.

(10) Sea Grant programs and marine extension services.

(11) Cooperative efforts to encourage, enhance and improve international programs for the protection of the environment and the conservation of natural resources otherwise within the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee.

(12) General and continuing oversight and investigative authority over activities, policies and programs within the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee.

*Subcommittee on Water and Power*

(1) Generation and marketing of electric power from Federal water projects by Federally chartered or Federal regional power marketing authorities.

(2) All measures and matters concerning water resources planning conducted pursuant to the Water Resources Planning Act, water resource research and development programs and saline water research and development.

(3) Compacts relating to the use and apportionment of interstate waters, water rights and major interbasin water or power movement programs.

(4) All measures and matters pertaining to irrigation and reclamation projects and other water resources development and recycling programs, including policies and procedures.

(5) Indian water rights and settlements.

(6) Cooperative efforts to encourage, enhance and improve international programs for the protection of the environment and the conservation of natural resources otherwise within the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee.

(7) General and continuing oversight and investigative authority over activities, policies and programs within the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee.

*Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources*

(1) All measures and matters concerning the U.S. Geological Survey, except for the activities and programs of the Water Resources Division or its successor.

(2) All measures and matters affecting geothermal resources.

(3) Conservation of United States uranium supply.

(4) Mining interests generally, including all matters involving mining regulation and enforcement, including the reclamation of mined lands, the environmental effects of mining, and the management of mineral receipts, mineral land laws and claims, long-range mineral programs and deep seabed mining.

(5) Mining schools, experimental stations and long-range mineral programs.

(6) Mineral resources on public lands.

(7) Conservation and development of oil and gas resources of the Outer Continental Shelf.

(8) Petroleum conservation on the public lands and conservation of the radium supply in the United States.

(9) Measures and matters concerning the transportation of natural gas from or within Alaska and disposition of oil transported by the trans-Alaska oil pipeline.

(10) Rights of way over public lands for underground energy-related transportation.

(11) Cooperative efforts to encourage, enhance and improve international programs for the protection of the environment and the conservation of natural resources otherwise within the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee.

(12) General and continuing oversight and investigative authority over activities, policies and programs within the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee.

*Subcommittee on Insular Affairs*

(1) All matters regarding insular areas of the United States.

(2) All measures or matters regarding the Freely Associated States and Antarctica.

(3) Cooperative efforts to encourage, enhance and improve international programs for the protection of the environment and the conservation of natural resources otherwise within the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee.

(4) General and continuing oversight and investigative authority over activities, poli-

cies and programs within the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee.

(b) Full Committee.—The Full Committee shall have the following jurisdiction and responsibilities:

(1) Environmental and habitat measures of general applicability.

(2) Measures relating to the welfare of Native Americans, including management of Indian lands in general and special measures relating to claims which are paid out of Indian funds.

(3) All matters regarding the relations of the United States with Native Americans and Native American tribes, including special oversight functions under Rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

(4) All matters regarding Native Alaskans and Native Hawaiians.

(5) All matters related to the Federal trust responsibility to Native Americans and the sovereignty of Native Americans.

(6) Cooperative efforts to encourage, enhance and improve international programs for the protection of the environment and the conservation of natural resources otherwise within the jurisdiction of the Full Committee under this paragraph.

(7) All measures and matters retained by the Full Committee, including those retained under Committee Rule 6(e).

(8) General and continuing oversight and investigative authority over activities, policies and programs within the jurisdiction of the Committee under House Rule X.

(c) Ex-officio Members.—The Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the Committee may serve as ex-officio Members of each standing Subcommittee to which the Chairman or the Ranking Minority Member have not been assigned. Ex-officio Members shall have the right to fully participate in Subcommittee activities but may not vote and may not be counted in establishing a quorum.

(d) Powers and Duties of Subcommittees.—Each Subcommittee is authorized to meet, hold hearings, receive evidence and report to the Committee on all matters within its jurisdiction. Each Subcommittee shall review and study, on a continuing basis, the application, administration, execution and effectiveness of those statutes, or parts of statutes, the subject matter of which is within that Subcommittee's jurisdiction; and the organization, operation, and regulations of any Federal agency or entity having responsibilities in or for the administration of such statutes, to determine whether these statutes are being implemented and carried out in accordance with the intent of Congress. Each Subcommittee shall review and study any conditions or circumstances indicating the need of enacting new or supplemental legislation within the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee. Each Subcommittee shall have general and continuing oversight and investigative authority over activities, policies and programs within the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee.

(e) Referral to Subcommittees; Recall.

(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2) and for those matters within the jurisdiction of the Full Committee, every legislative measure or other matter referred to the Committee shall be referred to the Subcommittee of jurisdiction within two weeks of the date of its referral to the Committee. If any measure or matter is within or affects the jurisdiction of one or more Subcommittees, the Chairman may refer that measure or matter simultaneously to two or more Subcommittees for concurrent consideration or for consideration in sequence subject to appropriate time limits, or divide the matter into two or more parts and refer each part to a Subcommittee.

(2) The Chairman, with the approval of a majority of the Majority Members of the

Committee, may refer a legislative measure or other matter to a select or special Subcommittee. A legislative measure or other matter referred by the Chairman to a Subcommittee may be recalled from the Subcommittee for direct consideration by the Full Committee, or for referral to another Subcommittee, provided Members of the Committee receive one week written notice of the recall and a majority of the Members of the Committee do not object. In addition, a legislative measure or other matter referred by the Chairman to a Subcommittee may be recalled from the Subcommittee at any time by majority vote of the Committee for direct consideration by the Full Committee or for referral to another Subcommittee.

(f) Consultation.—Each Subcommittee Chairman shall consult with the Chairman of the Full Committee prior to setting dates for Subcommittee meetings with a view towards avoiding whenever possible conflicting Committee and Subcommittee meetings.

(g) Vacancy.—A vacancy in the membership of a Subcommittee shall not affect the power of the remaining Members to execute the functions of the Subcommittee.

#### RULE 7. TASK FORCES, SPECIAL OR SELECT SUBCOMMITTEES.

(a) Appointment.—The Chairman of the Committee is authorized, after consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, to appoint Task Forces, or special or select Subcommittees, to carry out the duties and functions of the Committee.

(b) Ex-Officio Members.—The Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the Committee may serve as ex-officio Members of each Task Force, or special or select Subcommittee if they are not otherwise members. Ex-officio Members shall have the right to fully participate in activities but may not vote and may not be counted in establishing a quorum.

(c) Party Ratios.—The ratio of Majority Members to Minority Members, excluding ex-officio Members, on each Task Force, special or select Subcommittee shall be as close as practicable to the ratio on the Full Committee.

(d) Temporary Resignation.—A Member can temporarily resign his or her position on a Subcommittee to serve on a Task Force, special or select Subcommittee without prejudice to the Member's seniority on the Subcommittee.

(e) Chairman and Ranking Minority Member.—The Chairman of any Task Force, or special or select Subcommittee shall be appointed by the Chairman of the Committee. The Ranking Minority Member shall select a Ranking Minority Member for each Task Force, or standing, special or select Subcommittee.

#### RULE 8. RECOMMENDATION OF CONFEREES

Whenever it becomes necessary to appoint conferees on a particular measure, the Chairman shall recommend to the Speaker as conferees those Majority Members, as well as those Minority Members recommended to the Chairman by the Ranking Minority Member, primarily responsible for the measure. The ratio of Majority Members to Minority Members recommended for conferences shall be no greater than the ratio on the Committee.

#### RULE 9. COMMITTEE RECORDS

(a) Segregation of Records.—All Committee records shall be kept separate and distinct from the office records of individual Committee Members serving as Chairmen or Ranking Minority Members. These records shall be the property of the House and all Members shall have access to them in accordance with clause 2(e)(2) of House Rule XI.

(b) Availability.—The Committee shall make available to the public for review at reasonable times in the Committee office the following records:

(1) transcripts of public meetings and hearings, except those that are unrevised or unedited and intended solely for the use of the Committee; and

(2) the result of each rollcall vote taken in the Committee, including a description of the amendment, motion, order or other proposition voted on, the name of each Committee Member voting for or against a proposition, and the name of each Member present but not voting.

(c) Archived Records.—Records of the Committee which are deposited with the National Archives shall be made available for public use pursuant to House Rule VII. The Chairman of the Committee shall notify the Ranking Minority Member of any decision, pursuant to clause 3(b)(3) or clause 4(b) of House Rule VII, to withhold, or to provide a time, schedule or condition for availability of any record otherwise available. At the written request of any Member of the Committee, the matter shall be presented to the Committee for a determination and shall be subject to the same notice and quorum requirements for the conduct of business under Committee Rule 3.

(d) Records of Closed Meetings.—Notwithstanding the other provisions of this rule, no records of Committee meetings or hearings which were closed to the public pursuant to the Rules of the House of Representatives shall be released to the public unless the Committee votes to release those records in accordance with the procedure used to close the Committee meeting.

(e) Classified Materials.—All classified materials shall be maintained in an appropriately secured location and shall be released only to authorized persons for review, who shall not remove the material from the Committee offices without the written permission of the Chairman.

#### RULE 10. COMMITTEE BUDGET AND EXPENSES

(a) Budget.—At the beginning of each Congress, after consultation with the Chairman of each Subcommittee and the Ranking Minority Member, the Chairman shall present to the Committee for its approval a budget covering the funding required for staff, travel, and miscellaneous expenses.

(b) Expense Resolution.—Upon approval by the Committee of each budget, the Chairman, acting pursuant to clause 6 of House Rule X, shall prepare and introduce in the House a supporting expense resolution, and take all action necessary to bring about its approval by the Committee on House Administration and by the House of Representatives.

(c) Amendments.—The Chairman shall report to the Committee any amendments to each expense resolution and any related changes in the budget.

(d) Additional Expenses.—Authorization for the payment of additional or unforeseen Committee expenses may be procured by one or more additional expense resolutions processed in the same manner as set out under this rule.

(e) Monthly Reports.—Copies of each monthly report, prepared by the Chairman for the Committee on House Administration, which shows expenditures made during the reporting period and cumulative for the year, anticipated expenditures for the projected Committee program, and detailed information on travel, shall be available to each Member.

#### RULE 11. COMMITTEE STAFF

(a) Rules and Policies.—Committee staff members are subject to the provisions of clause 9 of House Rule X, as well as any writ-

ten personnel policies the Committee may from time to time adopt.

(b) Majority and Nonpartisan Staff.—The Chairman shall appoint, determine the remuneration of, and may remove, the legislative and administrative employees of the Committee not assigned to the Minority. The legislative and administrative staff of the Committee not assigned to the Minority shall be under the general supervision and direction of the Chairman, who shall establish and assign the duties and responsibilities of these staff members and delegate any authority he determines appropriate.

(c) Minority Staff.—The Ranking Minority Member of the Committee shall appoint, determine the remuneration of, and may remove, the legislative and administrative staff assigned to the Minority within the budget approved for those purposes. The legislative and administrative staff assigned to the Minority shall be under the general supervision and direction of the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee who may delegate any authority he determines appropriate.

(d) Availability.—The skills and services of all Committee staff shall be available to all Members of the Committee.

#### RULE 12. COMMITTEE TRAVEL

In addition to any written travel policies the Committee may from time to time adopt, all travel of Members and staff of the Committee or its Subcommittees, to hearings, meetings, conferences and investigations, including all foreign travel, must be authorized by the Full Committee Chairman prior to any public notice of the travel and prior to the actual travel. In the case of Minority staff, all travel shall first be approved by the Ranking Minority Member. Funds authorized for the Committee under clauses 6 and 7 of House Rule X are for expenses incurred in the Committee's activities within the United States.

#### RULE 13. CHANGES TO COMMITTEE RULES

The rules of the Committee may be modified, amended, or repealed, by a majority vote of the Committee, provided that 48 hours' written notice of the proposed change has been provided each Member of the Committee prior to the meeting date on which the changes are to be discussed and voted on. A change to the rules of the Committee shall be published in the Congressional Record no later than 30 days after its approval.

#### RULE 14. OTHER PROCEDURES

The Chairman may establish procedures and take actions as may be necessary to carry out the rules of the Committee or to facilitate the effective administration of the Committee, in accordance with the rules of the Committee and the Rules of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PAUL addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### DEPUTY GILMER HERNANDEZ ON PATROL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE. Madam Speaker, in west Texas, where the rattlesnake rules the hard, rugged land is Edwards County.

It is a sparsely populated place because not much grows on that dusty soil. Local landmarks include Devil's Sinkhole, a massive bat cave and a place called Bullhead. This land used to be the home of the fierce Lipan Apache Indians, dating all the way back to the 1600s.

This county, near the Texas-Mexico border, is the size of Delaware. On patrol of this massive place of over 2,000 square miles are only three deputy sheriffs. One of them is Gilmer Hernandez.

Recently, Deputy Hernandez was on patrol about midnight, alone. He came across a truck that had run a red light in the small quiet town of Rocksprings, Texas. He pulled the vehicle over and approached it. He noticed numerous people lying on the floor of the truck.

One thing led to another, and the vehicle sped off. Hernandez says the driver turned around and tried to run him down, so he fired numerous times at the vehicle. He shot out the tires. So the vehicle stopped and the occupants, they fled into the darkness. All except one, who was lying down on the floor, hiding in the back, wounded by a ricochet.

Deputy Hernandez immediately called the sheriff, Donald Letsinger. He immediately showed up, along with the Texas Rangers, to do routine follow-up work.

But then the Federal Government shows up and takes over the investigation. The Mexican Government is notified that an illegal from Mexico has been wounded in the United States.

Using poor law enforcement investigation techniques, the illegals are all interviewed together, but still give conflicting stories at a later trial.

After the dust settled, the Feds filed charges on Deputy Hernandez for firing a gun at the van. After being tried by a zealous prosecutor, Hernandez was convicted in Federal court. He is in jail waiting to be sentenced. And, yes, Madam Speaker, by the same Prosecutor's Office that prosecuted Compean.

Everyone in his hometown of Rocksprings, Texas has sided with Deputy Hernandez. They are taking care of his family.

But once again, our Federal Government has taken the other side, the wrong side of the border war. Our government is more concerned about illegals in the van than they are about the safety of Deputy Hernandez.

And get this: Our Federal Government even gave these illegals green cards and allowed them to stay in the United States.

Madam Speaker, this ought not to be. Deputy Hernandez did everything a normal person would have done in these circumstances, including immediately reporting the event.

Why is our government so relentless and zealous in prosecuting border protectors and not protecting the border?

Why does our government work backroom deals with illegals to convict our law officers?

Why does it seem the Federal Government is so quick to cooperate with Mexico to thwart border security?

And why does it allow these illegals more consideration than it does American peace officers?

Gilmer Hernandez is 25 years of age. He is married and has a young child. He makes \$21,000 a year being a lawman in rough west Texas.

It is disturbing. This trend is disturbing. Our government is saying to peace officers on the border, don't protect yourself on this border because if you do, you will not get protection from the government. And to the illegals that come in and are caught, the Federal Government is saying to them, fear not. We are from the Federal Government and we are here to help you.

Looks like another case of the Federal Government continuing to swoop in and save the day for the illegals who cross into American land.

The American government needs to gets on the right side, the American side of the border war.

And that's just the way it is.

□ 1800

#### ENERGY AND OIL COMPANY PROFITS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, last week ExxonMobil, the biggest of Big Oil companies, announced that its profits for 2006 totaled \$39.5 billion, the highest annual profits ever recorded for an American corporation.

Now I don't begrudge the right of any company to make profits, and certainly ExxonMobil has done quite a good job of doing so; but while they are out making money, it is our job here in Congress to ask what price we have all paid for those profits. The most obvious price has been the squeeze on working families. When gas prices hit \$3 per gallon last summer, it was low- and middle-income families just trying to get to work that took the brunt of the impact and had to readjust tight household budgets.

Are ExxonMobil's profits worth that kind of cost to our society? Is it fair that the world's most profitable corporation gets even more profitable while everyday Americans struggle to get by and provide for their children? Certainly that does seem unfair to me, but maybe the problem is not entirely ExxonMobil's fault—after all, they are just feeding America's fossil fuel habit. As President Bush said last, America is addicted to oil. As long as this addiction persists, Big Oil gets richer and average Americans suffer more.

Despite the President's pronouncement, however, that addiction has gotten worse over the last 6 years, when the Bush administration and the Republican-controlled Congress came up

with new and clever ways to hand out goodies for oil and gas companies. That was no way to run an energy policy, and all we wound up with 6 years later is higher gas prices, greater dependence on countries that really don't like us, and the increasing threat of global warming.

That is probably one reason why during last year's elections the American people clearly chose a new direction for America, and the new Democratic majority in the House responded.

During the first 100 hours of this Congress, we repealed massive tax breaks for Big Oil and funneled the money into a fund to promote clean and efficient energy technologies. It will go a long way towards promoting the right kinds of energy sources. It also signaled that Democrats are willing to end outdated policies that do nothing more than worsen our addiction to fossil fuels. And that is certainly not the end of our efforts.

Madam Speaker, our Speaker, NANCY PELOSI, and Majority Leader HOYER are planning new efforts to get the House to focus on energy independence and combating global warming. Energy independence means diversifying our energy sources so that we can free ourselves from the national economic and environmental security concerns of being too dependent on oil, gas and coal. And that means keeping gasoline, electricity and natural gas prices stable to make sure American families aren't jolted by sudden high prices.

It means reducing our oil consumption to the point where our foreign policy isn't being held hostage because we need oil from some of the most unstable or unfriendly places in the world, including Iran and Venezuela. It also means making sharp reductions in greenhouse gas pollution so we can stave off the worst impacts of global warming.

I just want to reemphasize that last point because global warming is one of the most serious challenges we are facing in the 21st century. For a district like mine near the Jersey shore, it means dealing with rising sea levels, more frequent floods, and stronger storms. For the country as a whole, it is a security issue.

The more the Earth warms because of pollution from fossil fuels, the more American families and businesses will have to deal with bigger disasters, more unpredictable weather, and a completely different climate.

The bottom line is that working towards energy independence and fighting global warming are real security questions for the American people. Unfortunately, we have wasted the last 6 years spending more time helping ExxonMobil's bottom line than we have dealing with these serious questions.

So this new Congress means an opportunity to move in a new direction. When it comes to energy independence and global warming, the new direction means actually putting forward solutions that will move us towards a

clean, sustainable, secure energy future.

We are going to raise the bar in this Congress. No longer should we be satisfied just to hear sound bites like "addicted to oil" and "serious challenge of climate change" that we heard in the President's State of the Union address. Now we can have a real dialogue about how to address these issues.

And I would just say, Madam Speaker, ExxonMobil may keep earning record profits, but this Congress, this Democratic majority Congress, has to keep its eyes on doing what is best for American families and for our environment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### NATIONAL PARKS FUNDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SOUDER. I wanted to take a few minutes tonight to congratulate the President on the initiative to boost funding for our national parks. Of all the news stories and the ruckus about Iraq and global warming and our borders and the death of Anna Nicole Smith, whatever bumps it out of the news, it has kind of been lost about a major new initiative for the upcoming centennial of the national parks.

I say "upcoming" because it is actually in 2016, but a number of us in the House several years ago introduced a National Park Centennial Act. Congressman BRIAN BAIRD and I, we formed the National Parks Caucus and in the House led the effort where we had, I believe, 67 Members. We, quite frankly, would have had more, but we systematically were trying to make sure that we had both Republicans and Democrats in relatively even numbers to show it was a bipartisan effort. And in the Senate, Senator MCCAIN and Senator FEINSTEIN were the leaders, along with Senator ALEXANDER. They had strong support over in the Senate.

The goal was to try to get rid of not only the backlog in the national parks, but trying to address where our parks were going to head in the next 100 years; that in the national parks one of our challenges has been that we have added homeland security challenges to the national parks because many of the sites that would have the most impact if they were attacked and destroyed are actually in our national parks. Whether it be Independence Hall or the Gateway Arch, for that matter, the Golden Gate Bridge, in addition to the monuments here in Washington, all come under the national parks. That

came out of the budget. It didn't come out of the Homeland Security budget, much like roads come out of the Transportation budget. They had to absorb that, they have had to move rangers in and absorb the Homeland Security costs.

Of course every agency is struggling with labor costs, health care costs, pension costs. And the net result of all this pressure on the national parks is, even though we have been steadily increasing funding here, with the additional costs in homeland security, the additional costs on employees and the additional land that we have added to the national parks system, the additional sites we have added, the additional conservation areas under a whole range of heritage areas, national roads and different things that go into their responsibility.

The net impact is that many of our national parks, we have seen as much as a 67 percent reduction in actual rangers at the parks. While we have put money on the backlog, a backlog doesn't mean that you have eliminated the problem. For example, if you fix the restroom at a park and you fix a visitors center or you fix a sewer system, because of amortization and declining facility and road use, you are constantly, by fixing the backlog, if you divert your money from your current operating to fix the backlog, it merely means now you are in effect getting a front-log. In other words, you are adding new expenses that then get added to the backlog. So even as we have increased funds here, we have fallen further behind.

And the question is what was our national parks system going to look like for our kids and for our grandkids. It is something that can easily get lost in whatever the crush of the day is. If it is immunization, if it is Medicaid, if it is prescription drugs for seniors, if it is border security, it gets lost in the system.

For the 50th anniversary that Congress passed sufficiently ahead of time, which is what we are trying to do here, what was called Mission 66, there was a commitment over a number of years to fund adequate funding for the national parks so for the 50th birthday, in 1966, we could see the roads, the visitation facilities and other things set for the 50th anniversary. That is why we require forward funding at this time.

This proposal by the administration is not exactly like the Centennial Act, but very similar. It commits dollars from the government, both directly for funding, roughly it looks like around 100 to \$200 million a year in direct funding, plus it creates a challenge grant. Now, the fundamental part of our bill was a challenge grant that people could take a deduction, and then whatever the shortfall was from the 270 million we needed annually, the Federal Government would make up the difference.

The total here is the same in the President's bill, but it has a direct one-

for-one match. Right now, if people give 20 million to the national parks, it will give up to a hundred million with a hundred million dollar match, plus additional to get to that 270 figure. We hopefully can do that up to now to 2016. And I hope this doesn't just put more rangers in the parks, as the President said, and meet the needs that we have in homeland security and infrastructure, but that we realize that our national park System isn't only wilderness, isn't only visitation, it isn't only going to the parks to see what are the classic mountain peaks or the great and wonderful deserts or the volcanoes, or whatever the particular natural park you think of, it is our number one place for historic preservation of buildings, of artifacts. It is the number one, arguably, place that we even have art in America because of all the parks and certain sites devoted to art. But it is more than just that. It is our number one laboratory in America where you still have wildlife, where you have trees and plants and frogs and things that you can scientifically study.

And I would also challenge, as we develop this, to look at creative ways that the National Park Service can use the Internet, can use the education to bring this to schools all over America, to families all over America, and not just if you visit the park, a ranger talk that now can draw a few people at the campfire. If we look ahead to the year 2016, that ought to be available on the Internet where in your home, by your own campfire, you can join in with the people that are actually at the campfire.

I hope that this passes Congress and that we are creatively looking at where the National Park Service will head in the year 2016.

[From USA Today]

#### PRESIDENT PUSHES BOOST IN FUNDING FOR NATIONAL PARKS

(By Richard Wolf)

WASHINGTON.—National parks would be a big winner under President Bush's 2008 budget, and a plan to match up to \$100 million annually in private donations could guarantee increases for a decade.

Bush's budget, being unveiled today, would give the National Park Service \$2.4 billion next year, administration officials told USA TODAY. That includes a \$258 million increase for daily operations, up 14.5%. Since 2002, those funds have risen 1.5% above inflation.

The president proposes adding at least \$100 million a year for the next 10 years. The funds would be used to hire 3,000 seasonal park rangers, guides and maintenance workers each summer, an increase of more than 50%. In addition, more than 1 million children could be enrolled in youth programs.

On top of that, Bush wants Congress to guarantee that the federal government would match philanthropic donations each year, up to another \$100 million. Currently, about \$20 million is contributed each year by supporters of national parks, such as family foundations.

Taken together, the proposals could provide \$3 billion in new parks funding over the coming decade. In 2016, the parks will celebrate their 100th anniversary; Bush wants them to be in better shape than they are today.

"I think it can be a source of healing for Americans," Interior Secretary Dirk Kempthorne said. "This one is not partisan. This one is American."

The proposal is being welcomed by groups that advocate on behalf of the nearly 400 sites managed by the National Park Service and have been a thorn in the Bush administration's side during lean years. The National Parks Conservation Association was seeking an increase of \$250 million in operating funds for the parks.

"This is a renewed commitment that national parks should be a national priority," said Tom Kiernan, the group's president. "It's a catalyzing initiative at a wonderful time for the national parks."

The proposals would have to be approved separately by Congress. The \$2.4 billion parks budget, with its record increase in operating funds, would become final if Congress allocates the funding. The matching-funds proposal would have to be approved by committees with jurisdiction over the Interior Department.

Taken together, they would add thousands of new park workers to guide visitors with programs such as interpretive walks and campfire talks. Volunteer coordinators would be added in 44 sites.

Seasonal workers have been cut during lean budget years, resulting in a 10-year decline.

"We simply have lost contact people who meet the American public," said Stephen Whitesell, superintendent of the San Antonio Missions National Historical Park in Texas. "What they're not seeing are rangers in flat hats."

Since 9/11, most of the money added to the National Park Service budget has gone for added security in such places as New York City, Washington, D.C., and along the U.S. borders with Canada and Mexico.

Some of the new funds will be used to attract young people to the parks through Internet programs and podcasts. Kempthorne and others see it as mutually beneficial: The parks would avoid a loss of visitors in future generations, and children would reap the health benefits of the great outdoors.

"We're competing with an electronic world," Kempthorne said.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. WOOLSEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### A LONG WAY TRAVELED AND A LONG WAY YET TO GO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Speaker, February is Black History Month, a time that we have set aside to honor the contributions that African Americans have made to this Nation. Some question the continuing need for a month-long celebration; others see it as a poor substitute for concerted national action to address the needs of African Americans. But Black History Month remains a time for reflection on the progress of our national journey towards a truly equal and just society.

America has traveled a long way in the last few decades, but we have a

long way yet to go. We have seen the promise of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.'s vision of a colorblind America, but its reality lies in too many ways still beyond our grasps.

In some respects, this is a historic moment for this country, and historians may look back on this period as the true beginning of a post-civil rights era, a time in which the statutory gains made by an earlier generation are bearing fruit as a new generation fully realizes its dream for themselves and their children.

The current Secretary of State, Condoleezza Rice, and her predecessor, Colin Powell, are black. One of the front-runners in the Democratic Party's 2008 Presidential contest, Barack Obama, is African American.

In 1974, Boston was the scene of protracted racial violence as the result of a court-ordered busing to integrate the city's schools. Last month, Massachusetts inaugurated its first black Governor, Deval Patrick.

Here in the House of Representatives, the Chair of the Democratic Caucus is African American, and five committees are chaired by black Members: Homeland Security, Judiciary, Ways and Means, Government Administration, and the Ethics Committee. Last Sunday for the first time two black head coaches faced each other in the Super Bowl.

It would be easy to look at these examples of African Americans who have made it to the summit of our national life and conclude that the shackles of oppression and prejudice have finally been released, but that is not the case. And even as we honor those who have risen, we cannot neglect the millions more who are still trying, including many whose lives were shattered by Hurricane Katrina only a year and a half ago. As Senator OBAMA has said, things are better, but better is not good enough.

It would be easy to look at the achievements of Dr. David Satcher, who served as Surgeon General of the United States from 1998 to 2002, or Dr. Keith Black, the chairman of the Department of Neurosurgery at Cedars-Sinai in L.A., and conclude that African Americans are well represented among the Nation's physicians. Unfortunately, while blacks make up 12 percent of the population, they comprise only 3.6 percent of the Nation's doctors. This paucity of African American doctors is one reason why blacks lag behind whites in a host of crucial medical indicators.

White women in the United States can expect to live more than 4 years longer than black women, and white men have a life expectancy that is over 6 years longer than African American men.

□ 1815

African Americans in the U.S. also have higher mortality rates than Caucasians for many diseases, including heart disease, stroke, diabetes, pros-

tate cancer, breast cancer and AIDS. Nationwide, the infant mortality rate for blacks is double that, double that of the white population.

Or we could look with optimism on the achievements of black business professionals, who are increasingly found in the upper management of American corporations and who are starting their own businesses at an ever-increasing rate. African Americans who own businesses increased by nearly a third in the 5 years from 1997 to 2002 and now number more than half a million nationwide. But these numbers cannot compensate for the fact that only four of the Nation's Fortune 500 companies are led by African Americans.

More generally, the median income for white households is \$48,000, while that of black households is only \$31,000. More telling, nearly one in four African Americans live in poverty, while fewer than one in ten whites do.

It would be easy to look at the achievements of Neil de Grasse Tyson, the astrophysicist and director of the Hayden Planetarium, and Dr. Stephen Mayo, an associate professor of biology and chemistry at CalTech and think that the burden of inferior schools has been lifted from the shoulders of African Americans. Sadly, that is not the case.

At every level of education, blacks are disadvantaged in the classroom. According to the NAACP, far less money is spent on black pupils than on white pupils, more than \$1,400 less per student in most impoverished areas. This inequality means that black children do not get access to the technology and other resources that white kids have.

More importantly, the quality of teachers in predominantly African American schools is not equal to that of teachers in white schools. These schools have the least experienced teachers, the highest percentage of out-of-field teachers, the highest teacher mobility rates, the greatest incidence of teachers who leave the profession. The consequences are predictable: profound gaps in reading and math that emerge in early elementary school and persist through high school, and much lower high school graduation rates.

So, Madam Speaker, even as we celebrate the many and profound gifts that African Americans have made to our country, we cannot lose sight of the urgent need for all of us to do more to rededicate ourselves to achieving the equality that is the cornerstone of American democracy. Things are better, but better is not good enough.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. SHEA-PORTER). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DREIER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ENGLISH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. ENGLISH addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### THE PAINFUL COST OF THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Speaker, on Monday, the President submitted his budget for our Nation. In that budget, it would be easy to look at it and say, this is all about numbers, it is just a rational approach, it is just a plan, it is an impersonal thing. But, in fact, Madam Speaker, what a budget is is a moral statement about who matters in our society.

What a budget is is a reflection of our own humanity. It talks about who counts, who doesn't, who matters, who doesn't, what are our priorities. In fact, what the budget shows, Madam Speaker, is our values and what we hold dear, and what we believe is really just not that important.

Let me say as we approach this budgetary season, this process in Congress, it is very important to remember that this budget will tell much, much more about our society and who we are than we might imagine. In fact, we should use some guiding principles as we approach this budget. And one of them is very simple, and it is a quote that comes from the great late Senator Hubert Humphrey from my State of Minnesota.

Senator Humphrey said, "The moral test of any government is how it treats those in the dawn of life, the children; those in the dusk of life, the elderly; and those in the shadow of life, the disadvantaged."

This budget is a measure of how we stand, how we fit along these very important metrics that Senator Humphrey laid out for us. And by that test, the proposal that the President set forth fails. It doesn't value the hardworking investment, the hardworking energy, the blood, sweat and tears of Minnesotans or Americans.

This budget proposal diminishes the importance of health. It includes \$78

billion in Medicare and Medicaid cuts and billions in new premiums that threaten to endanger Minnesota's 691,000 Medicare patients' access to care that they need to lead healthy, independent lives.

This budget proposal does not value children in the dawn of life. It underfunds by \$10 billion the State Children's Health Insurance Program. The administration itself argues that it needs \$15 billion just to continue covering those children already enrolled in the program. With only \$5 billion proposed to cover its neediest children, we will almost certainly add to, not subtract from, the already 86,000 uninsured children in Minnesota.

Minnesota's 407,000 veterans will undoubtedly be hurt by the President's proposed VA funding cuts. Nearly one-half of the military servicemen and women in Iraq and Afghanistan will require health care services for the physical and psychological impairments and traumas of war, yet the President's budget cuts in half the minimum annual increase needed, according to the Veterans Health Administration.

The President freezes funds for college work-study funds and zeroes out Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants at a time when tuition and fees at schools like the University of Minnesota have soared nearly 50 percent in just 4 years.

It eliminates two of Minnesota's most effective local crime fighting tools, the COPS, Community Oriented Policing Service program, and the Justice Assistance Grants.

It reduces Minnesota's Community Block Grant Development program by \$17.2 million, which is the cornerstone of Minneapolis and the Fifth Congressional District's affordable housing and revitalization program.

And it goes on: public housing cut by \$450 million; Section 8 housing vouchers cut by \$500 million; Section 11 disabled housing cut by \$121 million; elderly housing cut by \$160 million; lead paint prevention cut by \$38 million; zero funding for Brownfields redevelopment.

Madam Speaker, a budget is a moral barometer of a nation. It is a reflection of our values. This budget proposal does not value people, but it does value the privileged, because it proposes to maintain permanent tax breaks for the President's wealthy friends.

The President proposes making his 2001 and 2003 tax cuts permanent. This includes reducing rates on capital gains and dividends, a phaseout of the temporary repeal of the estate tax, educational tax incentives and child tax credits. The cost to you and me? Well, that is \$373.9 billion over 5 years; \$1.6 trillion over 10.

Remember the cuts the President proposes? Kids, COPS, Justice Assistance Grants, Community Block Grants. The fact is, Madam Speaker, we have to build a new politics of inclusion, a new politics of generosity, a new politics of peace, a new politics that says

that our parents and our seniors are precious, our students are precious, our veterans are precious, and we value them.

And tax cuts for the most privileged people amongst us, there is just not time for that right now. We have to ask all Americans of all wealth positions to pony up for the good of the whole Nation.

#### TRIBUTE TO YARDLY POLLAS-KIMBLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RUSH. Madam Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge a woman who has touched the lives of so many people with her caring, her intelligence, her compassion and her generosity. This woman has been a friend and inspiration to me personally and has affected the lives of so many people here in the Congress, in the First Congressional District which I represent, as well as throughout the country, with her wisdom and her expertise in the legislative process.

Madam Speaker, I am referring to my deputy chief of staff and legislative director for the past 9 years, Mrs. Yardly Pollas-Kimble. It saddens me to announce that Mrs. Pollas-Kimble will be leaving my office and embarking on a career in the private sector, where I am sure she will continue to be very successful and widely acclaimed.

Madam Speaker, anyone who has worked on the Hill for any significant amount of time has probably heard of or worked with Mrs. Pollas-Kimble in some capacity. Not only has Mrs. Pollas-Kimble been the glue that has held my office together for so many years, but she is a person that countless other staffers from many offices on both sides of the aisle have come to rely on for information, for direction and for guidance. I don't know of anyone who has been so accessible to so many people, and always with a smile on her face, as Yardly has been.

Directing my legislative agenda for the past 9 years, Mrs. Pollas-Kimble has been someone that I have come to rely on deeply, and she has guided many legislative initiatives for my office, including the COPE Act, the Family Telephone Connection Protection Act, the Telecommunication Ownership Diversity Act, the Nursing Relief for Disadvantaged Areas Act, and the Payday Borrower Protection Act.

By the way, Madam Speaker, if any of my colleagues would like to sign on as cosponsors to any of these fine pieces of legislation, they can call Yardly today or tomorrow before she leaves.

But seriously, Madam Speaker, my office and Congress as a whole will truly be missing a jewel of a person when Mrs. Pollas-Kimble leaves the Hill. Rarely have I worked with a person who so seamlessly embodies the

spirit of the American dream, with the perfect combination of ingenuity, creativity, class, compassion and intellect.

Born in New York City, and I won't say what year, Yardly moved with her family to Haiti when she was 8 years old. While in Haiti, Yardly saw both the natural beauty in the people, language and culture, as well as the poverty and destitution that she would later dedicate her life to helping to eradicate, not only in Haiti, but throughout the world.

After graduation from high school at the age of 16, which proves that she was a genius, Yardly returned to this country where she graduated from the University of Houston with her Bachelor's degree in politics. Yardly would go on to earn a Master's degree in public accounting and a Juris Doctorate from American University here in Washington, D.C.

After receiving her MPA, Yardly traveled to West and Central Africa, where she spent 2 years monitoring elections in fledgling democracies. While in Africa, Yardly was able to hone her multilingual skills, as today she is a fluent speaker of four languages, including French, Spanish, English and Creole.

While attending the University of Houston, Yardly would meet fellow classmates and future husband Kevin Kimble, and the two were married in 1992. Today they have two beautiful children, Anael and Kohl, who are both on the path to education and leadership.

Madam Speaker, I can't express how much Yardly has meant to my office, where she has been a trusted advisor, a confidant and a friend to me. Yardly has also served as a mentor and a tutor of the legislative process to everyone on my staff who has been a part of our family. Additionally, I cannot count the times I have seen staffers from other offices call or drop by to ask Yardly's opinions on specific legislation or the legislative process.

Madam Speaker, I have been truly blessed to have Yardly on my staff for so many years, and I am truly proud to call her a friend. I know she will be successful in future endeavors.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PENCE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

□ 1830

MAE CARDELLA CARR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Madam Speaker, it is such a privilege for me to stand in this Chamber to honor and

speak words of tribute to a beloved lady, born Mae Cardella Fox on a cold December day in 1913. Mae was the essential coal miner's daughter and grew up in a small miner's camp close to Habersham, Tennessee.

When she was only 11 years old, her mother died of pneumonia. Being the oldest daughter at home, she bravely embraced the crushing challenge at her age of maintaining a household and cooking for her siblings and her father.

When she was 16 years old, just as the Great Depression was falling upon America, she married another coal miner by the name of Earl Carr. The two of them were deeply committed to each other, and by themselves alone, using only hand tools, they built their first home, a log cabin on Pine Mountain above Morley, Tennessee.

When Mae was still in her twenties, her husband Earl was in a terrible accident when a coal mine caved in, killing many of his friends and breaking his own back and disabling him for life. When rescue workers reached him, he had already begun to dig himself out.

To take care of her severely injured husband and family, Mae began to take in laundry and clean houses, and she said she canned every kind of berries that grew in the Smoky Mountains. The older children gathered and sold holly at Christmas time, and the entire family gathered coal that fell from the tipples where the train cars were loaded. They said sometimes the workers would deliberately throw out coal for the families.

As the children grew in number and in stature, the family would travel to Florida in citrus season to pick oranges. It was there that my first memories of Mae and Earl Carr were born. I can remember at 4 years old waking up before daylight and climbing into a tarpaulin-covered truck, called a doghouse, and going to the orange groves to help pick oranges with Mae and the rest of her family.

To find better work, the family moved to Colorado, close to Juanita Franks, one of Mae and Earl's married daughters. While they were there, a grandson with a missing palate and a cleft lip was born to Juanita. Mae lovingly helped feed this little baby with a pill cup and an eyedropper until surgery could be performed. Madam Speaker, this is only one small instance of all of the acts of love and devotion this precious woman bestowed on every member of her family.

Mae Carr loved Jesus and her family more than anything else in life, and in all of the joys and struggles of their lives and 64 years of marriage, Earl and Mae Carr became the patriarch and matriarch of a family that would number 11 children, 47 grandchildren, 76 great-grandchildren, 22 great-great-grandchildren, and two more on the way.

A few days ago, in her 94th year of life, I was called to the bedside of Mae Carr, who as it happens, Madam Speaker, is my precious grandmother, and

who was called home to meet her Savior on February 7, 2007.

Among her last words to me were those contained in a phrase I had heard her say many times before, and expanded just this once. She said, "Trent, the truth will stand when the world is on fire; and the truth will still be here when the world is gone."

Madam Speaker, if all of us in this institution and this world could learn the reverence for truth and the love for humanity personified in this four-foot-eleven coal miner's daughter, the entire human family would be nobly transformed.

I will cherish those final moments with her for the rest of my life, because her mind at the time was still keen and perfectly lucid, and I was able to tell her not just how much I loved her, she already knew that, but I was able to tell her how much we were grateful for her 94 years of loving all of those about her, for loving life, and for making this world a better place to live. And, most importantly, Madam Speaker, I was able to remind her that indeed her life was a profound victory and that all of her dreams had come true.

Because you see, Madam Speaker, Mae Carr's dreams, though profound beyond words, were simple dreams: a family to love and nurture and support, children, grandchildren, great-grandchildren, and even great-great-grandchildren who would learn her heartfelt love for God and her fellow human beings. Her family now stands as a living testament to her life and her noble dreams fulfilled. And her greatest dream, Madam Speaker, is also now fulfilled as she stands in the presence of her Savior and has heard His eternal words of victory, "Well done, my good and faithful servant."

The truth will stand when the world is on fire, and the truth will still be here when the world is gone. Mae Cardella Carr.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. KLEIN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. KLEIN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MCHENRY addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### IRAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ANDREWS. Madam Speaker, I would like to begin my remarks with words of appreciation for Mr. Robert Knotts, who served with distinction as my legislative director and who will be leaving our office next week to further advance his career. I want to express my appreciation to Robert, Madam Speaker, for the service he has given to our constituents and the fine work he has done as a member of this institution.

He has helped me prepare these remarks tonight, and I mean them in a heartfelt way to say thank you.

For the last 25 years, the regime in Iran has secretly and unlawfully commenced the process of acquiring a nuclear weapon. This is a grave threat to peaceful and freedom-loving people around the world. This is a regime headed by a president who just recently has said that one Holocaust was not enough, that we need another one; a regime headed by a president who said that Israel should be wiped off the face of the Earth; a regime that has flagrantly and blatantly disregarded international law in pursuing this weapon of mass death.

I believe that it should be a policy not only of our country but of freedom-loving nations around the world that this regime in Iran must never have a nuclear weapon that it could use against its neighbors or other peace-loving people around the world. It is truly a grave threat. In my view, Madam Speaker, it is a grave threat that calls for diplomacy, strategy, and cooperation, and not for a reckless rush into armed conflict. That is the purpose, Madam Speaker, of my remarks here this evening.

I am troubled by recent signs that I have seen from our administration with respect to the issue of Iran. Placement of naval assets in that area of the world is justified as a defensive measure, but I worry that it may be a provocative measure. The words of our President are words which can be taken, and I hope they are meant in the spirit of warning and cooperation, but they could also be taken in the spirit of provocation, and I hope and pray that they are not meant in that regard.

My principal message though this evening is not one about answering the question as to what we should do about the threat of a nuclear weapon in Iran. My principal message is to find who the "we" in that sentence is, what "we" should do about the question of nuclear proliferation in Iran.

The Constitution of this country vests the sole authority to declare war in the Congress of the United States of America. Our Presidents as commanders in chief have inherent authority to protect our country in time of emergency and to act in self-defense, but it is a clear principle of this Constitution that the power to initiate hostilities, the power to declare war, rests in this body and the other body.

I think it is imperative in the days and weeks ahead that in whatever forum, in whatever way, this House go on record as reaffirming that constitutional prerogative with specific reference to the issue of what we should do about Iran.

If there is to be consideration of military action involving Iran, in my judgment, such consideration would be reckless and premature at this time and under these facts. But if there is to be consideration of military action, it should be careful, deliberate, thoughtful consideration done under the auspices of this Constitution.

America's greatest resource in the area of national defense is the men and women who step forward voluntarily to serve this country and wear the uniform of this country. They step forward because of their faith that we are a country that follows the rule of law, and not the edict or desire of any one man or woman irrespective of what office he or she is elected to. It is my concern that that faith would be eroded and indeed misplaced if we do not follow the rule of law in this crucial instance.

This House needs to affirm our constitutional prerogative in this matter. There should be no consideration of the initiation of any preemptive hostilities against Iran or anyone else without the careful, thorough, constitutional consideration that such a question mandates and demands.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### BIG OIL AND ENERGY INDEPENDENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, I imagine that I am not the only Member who hears from constituents regularly when oil companies report record profits, particularly with gas prices being what they have been over the past year.

Last Friday, the New York Times had this headline: World's Largest Oil Companies Gushing Profits. The Times story followed a report that ExxonMobil, the world's largest publicly traded company, had enjoyed the largest annual profit for any company in history, almost \$40 billion in 1 year, at a time when extraordinarily high gasoline prices were punishing the budgets of almost every family in our country and punishing the budgets of every business in our country.

Did ExxonMobil lower the prices at the pump to adjust for these egregious

profits? Absolutely not. In its first order of business, it spent almost \$10 billion to buy back its own stock, and then it took some of its profits to create a disinformation campaign against the panel on climate change.

And, finally, this week what did ExxonMobil do? It went after the State of Alabama, and lawyers for the company asked the Alabama Supreme Court to overturn a \$3.5 billion punitive damage award that was made by a jury 3 years ago when it found that Exxon had defrauded the State of royalties for natural gas production in Mobile Bay. Actually, the original fine had been \$11.9 billion.

You know, it must be hard being a giant oil company these days. It must be hard work making so much money you don't know how to spend it. That is not a problem most American families can relate to, but that is the problem that the giant oil companies face today.

The New York Times article reported that the world's 10 biggest oil companies made more than \$100 billion in profit in 2004, more than the gross domestic product of all of Malaysia, and their sales were more than \$1 trillion more than the gross domestic product of Canada.

The Associated Press reported earnings of ExxonMobil, ChevronTexaco, ConocoPhillips, BP, Royal Dutch/Shell, their earnings exceeded \$142 billion, enough to buy every person in the United States 175 gallons of midgrade gasoline. Those combined profits, said the AP, surpassed the gross domestic product of Iraq and more than 160 other nations.

Keep in mind, 6 years ago before President Bush was placed in office, crude oil futures were trading below \$15 a barrel, one-fourth less than today. The price of oil when President Bush was placed in office was \$23.19 a barrel; last month, it was \$52.25 a barrel. The dollar value of imports to the United States for the first 11 months of 2001, President Bush's first year in office, was \$69.9 billion, but last year it was up 187 percent to \$201.2 billion. When will we learn the true cost of our dependence on foreign oil?

It is no surprise that the world's largest oil reserves are located in the Middle East: Saudi Arabia, Iran, Iraq, Kuwait, the United Arab Emirates. And the hot new area, of course, for exploration is Africa; and I imagine that may be a reason President Bush this week announced a new U.S.-Africa Command.

Not to take a back seat, the Peoples Republic of China has offered more than \$5 billion in grants and loans in Africa, not out of the goodness of its heart, because we saw the compassion of the Chinese Government in Tiananmen Square, but China is interested in Africa's natural resources, including oil. And now the Bush administration is trying to play catch-up.

A cynic would say you could look at that list of nations and probably dis-

cern where the next war will break out, but that would be tantamount to saying that the Bush administration started a war with Iraq over oil, and we all know that cannot possibly be true.

But it is not hard to make the case between record high gasoline prices, record high oil company profits, and record high U.S. trade deficits.

□ 1845

The American people understand the connection. They live the connection every day, and they expect this Congress to do something about it. Not 25 years from now, not 20 or 15 years from now, but this year, to move our Nation toward energy independence with dispatch.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT OF IRAQ RESOLUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Madam Speaker, today we got word that a fellow Representative from the State of Georgia, Representative CHARLIE NORWOOD, has gone home to Augusta after battling cancer here in Washington, DC. at various facilities. And he has handled his affliction bravely, and he has been an example of a great fighting spirit. We wish his family the best, and he is in our prayers as he continues his battle.

Today, Madam Speaker, I rise to give the people of the Fourth District of Georgia a voice in the debate on Iraq.

Today, I introduced the first bill of my young congressional career, House Resolution 140. I look forward to presenting plans soon to directly better the lives of my constituents and others in need throughout this great country.

However, the conflict in Iraq is consuming our time, thoughts, and funds; and people of goodwill must speak when given the opportunity, and this is my opportunity to speak.

In order to move toward an end to the Iraq war, we need to push for two things: number one, ending troop presence, U.S. troop presence, on the streets of Iraq; and, two, securing the Iraqi Government.

United States troops engaged in street patrol throughout the country expose themselves to massive violence, and it is arguably keeping this war going long past the time it should have been completed. Our troops are doing an excellent job, Madam Speaker, but the insurgents use their presence throughout the country to justify attacks on them, and actually 60 percent of the Iraqi people support those attacks against our servicemen and -women on the streets of Iraq.

So why do they continue to be sent out into the streets of Iraq, into a world of explosive devices and sniper bullets without adequate armor? Madam Speaker, I am tired of seeing our troops lose their precious lives for

this seemingly unending cause. So I am requesting in this resolution, House Resolution 140, that they be taken off the streets and allowed to focus on a mission that would truly help bring about an end to this war once and for all.

Make no mistake, the job of hunting insurgents throughout Iraqi neighborhoods is noble, but this is a job for the Iraqis, not American troops who should be on their way home. The time has come for a new strategy, Madam Speaker, one that focuses on taking our troops out of harm's way and preserving the Iraqi Government to finally take the mantle.

Once that government is up and running, they will be able to put the Iraqi military into action; develop a plan to ensure Sunnis, Shias, and Kurds benefit from Iraq's vast oil resources; create jobs; and do the numerous other things necessary to bring peace to that troubled land.

We must also consider the lives of millions of Iraqi civilians. Are the insurgents using our presence, the presence of United States troops, on the streets of Baghdad as an excuse to blow up neighborhoods? Would they be better protected if we significantly reduce our presence? I believe so, Madam Speaker, and it is another reason that the President and the Secretary of Defense should consider instituting this plan. This is a practical solution to that seemingly unsolvable problem.

The use of the Iraqis will reduce war expenses as well, lessening the burden on the American taxpayer and bring about a quicker conclusion to this conflict.

Madam Speaker, it is time to bring this war to a responsible end for the American people, for the Iraqis, and for our brave troops. And I will continue to do all I can to help make this a reality.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. CHRISTENSEN addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### THE PROPOSED TROOP ESCALATION IN IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CARNAHAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Madam Speaker, I want to congratulate the gentleman from Georgia on his legislation, and I look forward to working with him on those efforts with many others here in the House.

When the American people and this Congress stand in unity, great change is possible. Last fall from every corner of our Nation, we spoke loud and clear to demand an end to the Bush adminis-

tration's open-ended stay-the-course policy in Iraq and start a new direction. That unity has changed control of this very Congress, led to the departure of Secretary Rumsfeld, helped drive the bipartisan consensus behind the Iraq Study Group recommendations.

Yet the Bush administration, in response, proposes another escalation, a so-called surge. As I said last month on this floor, the escalation plan flies in the face of military experts, of the bipartisan Iraq Study Group, Democratic and Republican leaders in this Congress, and the American public. This Congress has a solemn duty to listen and take action.

Recently, the mother of a young soldier being deployed back to Iraq told me, Congressman CARNAHAN, I am one of those mothers who is against the war in Iraq. But my son volunteered to serve his country. Please be sure they get the support and equipment they need to come home quickly and safely.

That mother's heartfelt request is a powerful example of our national unity and resolve to support our troops and oppose the escalation policy that is not making the Iraqi Government more self-reliant, not making the Middle East region more stable, and not making our country safer.

Next week, after this Iraq war has extended longer even than World War II, this Congress will have an historic, long, and thorough debate about the escalation plan. I believe the result will be a bipartisan vote reflecting the reality that a fourth U.S. escalation is the wrong direction for our country.

When this Congress acts in unison with the American people, great change is possible. In the weeks and months ahead, I believe this Congress will undertake its constitutional responsibilities with all seriousness and dispatch to continue this solemn debate, to exercise detailed oversight, and to use the tools available to us to change the direction of the war, to support our troops, to de-escalate the war, and to escalate the political solution in Iraq.

Working together, great change is possible.

#### THE WAR ON TERROR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, I hope the gentleman from Missouri would just suspend a moment before he leaves the floor.

I would like to have the privilege to address the subject matter that he raised and the issue of the Iraq Study Group. And it is somewhat of a long book to read through, but I had a conversation this afternoon with the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), and I have lifted some things out of the Iraq Study Group's report that are clearly part of the President's agenda in Iraq,

"The New Way Forward," and Mr. WOLF assures me that the entire strategy in Iraq is right from the Iraq Study Group.

So I point out to the gentleman from Missouri, and I would be happy to yield to him if he had a response, that the plan and the strategy of the President's for a new way forward in Iraq is not flying in the face of the Iraq Study Group. In fact, it follows directly down the path of the Iraq Study Group. If the gentleman from Missouri would care to engage, I would certainly be willing to yield.

I came here to talk about that subject matter, in fact, Madam Speaker. And as I listened to my colleagues in preparation for this 60-minute Special Order, I will just take from the top some of the notes that come to mind.

And one is, from the beginning, the gentleman from New Jersey spoke about ExxonMobil's highest corporate profits, the highest corporate profits, perhaps, ever in the history of the country, and the promise by this Pelosi Congress to provide energy independence. And then the gentlewoman from Ohio also spoke about ExxonMobil's profits, and the details of that were such that they have \$40 billion in profits. Did they lower prices at the pump?

Well, yes. Prices at the pump are a dollar a gallon cheaper than they were when oil prices were up to \$75 a barrel. In fact, the prices at the pump almost directly reflect the lowering of the prices and the cost of the barrels of crude oil.

And then, of course, the argument that there was a class action lawsuit against them for \$3.5 billion. And one might take that as a concern until one sees that that, Madam Speaker, is Alabama. Well, Alabama is a venue shoppers' State of choice. Someone who has a lawsuit, and the attorneys across this country know this, when they want to bring a class action lawsuit, they look around and they say what State has favorable laws; what State produces favorable juries. Where is the class envy so focused and where they have a belief that you can put 12 men and women on a jury and they would lay out a punitive case against a company because they see a company as somehow or another an evil Big Brother.

That is how you end up with these \$3.5 billion or maybe \$9 billion punitive damages in a class action lawsuit.

We have dealt with this, Madam Speaker, in the Judiciary Committee in the years that I have been in this Congress, and we passed legislation out of the House, and not successful in the Senate, that would allow a company that operates in multiple States, in fact, maybe internationally, to be able to ask that a case that has been venue shopped and taken to a State where there is a minimal amount of economic activity but a maximum amount of punitive damages offered by the juries there, a State that has that kind of reputation, we have passed legislation here in the House that would allow

that to be changed to a Federal venue rather than a State venue so that we can eliminate some of this ghastly profiteering that is taking place and the punishment of some of our best corporate citizens that we have in America.

And I sat here tonight and listened to a handful of speakers, and two of them turned their focus on ExxonMobil, and they can't seem to understand that because we have large and successful oil companies in America that they are continuing to invest those profits into research and development and exploration.

The gentlewoman from Ohio lamented that they bought back \$10 billion worth of their stock. Can she speculate that perhaps that gives them enough control now that they can invest more of their profits in exploration? And if they invest more in exploration, that means there will be more oil on the market, which means then, of course, this law of supply and demand, which I believe in, which everyone on the Republican side of the aisle believes in, which some of the people on the other side of the aisle believe in, that supply and demand will drive down our prices. And that is exactly what has been happening, Madam Speaker.

So I have to rise in defense of the companies that have provided cheap gas in this country, cheap oil in this country, and even still, whatever the price of gas is, milk is still more expensive. But not only that, the product that has been free all of my life, that product called "drinking water" and, in fact, now bottled water, is more expensive in the machine at the gas station per gallon than a gallon of gas is coming out of the pump right next to it by far. In fact, the last time I calculated that, it was a little over \$9 a gallon to get your bottled water out of the machine at the gas station where gas was selling for about \$2.15.

So we need to keep this in perspective. We cannot be punishing those companies that are out there exploring and putting this oil on the market so that we have the convenience of relatively cheap fuel and the mobile society that we have. If we did not have these companies and you pulled their expertise and their capital and their reserves off the market, we would be far, far more dependent upon Middle Eastern oil and much, much more of America's economy and the profits that we have would be skimmed off to go to the Middle East to fund the people who are lined up against us militarily and philosophically.

□ 1900

We are trying to get to energy independence. The Pelosi plan doesn't take us to energy independence. In the first 100 hours, one of those first six pieces of legislation, H.R. 1 through 6, pick your number, the one that addressed energy, went out and punished oil companies. It said, if you have leases, and

particularly some leases that were perhaps profitable in the gulf coast, if you have leases that are deemed by the government to be profitable, we are going to require you, as a company, to renegotiate those leases. If you don't renegotiate, then we are going to forbid you, ban you, blackball you, blacklist you from a company that can negotiate future leases offshore, like, actually, I believe, domestically in shore on land and in the United States.

Now, what kind of a deal is it when you have a deal, and the Congress comes here and passes legislation that says a deal is not a deal. Yes, you had a deal. We signed it all in good faith, but we found out it was a good deal. So now we are going to take some of that profit ourselves. I have spent my life in the contracting business, and I have invested a little bit of capital, and I was able to add a little more to it and roll a little back in and work hard and take some chances and work smart.

Over a period of time, I was able to build a little capital up and get to the point where we could bid some projects that had some significant value. I have seen this kind of envy rise up when someone looks over and sees the industrious nature of their neighbor and decides they want some of that hard-earned profit. I have had it happen to me when I had a contract that I had significant profit in.

I can think of one in particular where I was able to purchase some materials because I negotiated. I played my cards right, I went and built those relationships with all the people that were involved. It was a string of people through bankruptcy and banks. In the process of doing that, everything had to come together just right. The timing had to be just right. I was at great risk if I was not successful in putting that all together so that I could buy a large quantity of dirt for a reasonable price and it was handy.

In fact, when I first talked to the banker about that piece of land, he said it would take \$25,000 just to retain an attorney to represent me in negotiating the purchase of that. That gives you a measure of how difficult it was. But, in fact, I was successful purchasing that earth on that farm for the purposes of taking it into a project we were building, and, of course, I made some money.

If I had been wrong, if I hadn't been able to complete that purchase, then it would have cost me a lot of money. But when the time came, the owners sat me down, and the engineers sat me down, and they said, well, we see that you are making money here, and now we would like you to discount the work you are doing because we think you can afford to do that.

I looked them in the face, and I thought, well, why are you asking me to give some of my profit over to the owners? Isn't it all justly earned? And isn't it ethical, and didn't I bid this for a price, and was not it low bid? Not a no bid, but a low-bid contract? They

said, well, yes, but we think that you have some to give, and so we are asking you to discount your work, do it more cleanly, because we think you can afford to.

Well, what principle are you basing that judgment on because someone can't afford to discount something? How can you ask them to do that in a free enterprise society? I asked that question of the engineers, and they said, well, again, we they think that you can afford to do that.

So let me ask you a question. If I had lost my shirt on this job, which I likely could have done, and maybe even lost my business, would you have stepped up and said things didn't go so well for you, here is some extra? They just smiled and snickered a little bit because they knew it was ludicrous to think that when things go bad that there is going to be anybody in there holding my hand or ExxonMobil's hands or Shell's or Chevron's or anybody else's. They suffer all of their losses, and they have to have a margin in the work that they do.

We must have successful companies here operating out of the United States, and especially developing our domestic supplies of energy. If we fail to do that, then we are absolutely dependent upon middle eastern oil. If we are up to that 60 percent or so of our oil that is imported now, think what it would be like, Madam Speaker, if it was 100 percent.

So this effort to go down here and argue that we will see energy dependence under Pelosi's term here in Congress, I would submit that they have done anything but. They have changed the deal and said the Federal Government's word is not good, we want a tax, windfall profits. If we can find a way where we are jealous of your profit, we will find a way where we can take it and put it into the government coffers.

A company that will look at that is going to take their profits and decide why do I want to invest my profits in further exploration if the Federal Government is going to come in and cancel the deal, which they have done. I will submit that, perhaps, \$40 million that may be available, and it is probably a lot more than that is available for exploration, that will continue to put oil supply on the market.

I would submit that it is more likely that exploration investment will go overseas to foreign countries, and perhaps even into the Middle East and places where we don't have such a stable environment, while we sit on massive supplies and energy here in the United States, not because the oil is not there, not because the natural gas isn't there, but because this Congress has become a jealous Congress. This Congress has become a vindictive Congress. This Congress has become a Congress that has decided that they are going to play legislative corporate class envy against companies that are providing an economic supply of energy to this country.

I have always had the view that if I didn't like the way someone was doing business, if I thought they were making too much profit, then that should say to the whole world, well, there is opportunity there. If Exxon is making all of this profit, and it has made so many people irate that out of six or eight speakers two of them come to the floor to speak about that very thing, then I would submit, go out and start your own oil company.

That is the American way. You have a chance to do whatever you want to do in this country. Go ahead and get an investor's group together, or go buy up a group of oil companies, put them together and go out there, and invest your capital, see how you do.

In fact, I welcome that. I think we need a lot of competition, and we need a lot of exploration, and we need to be developing our oil supplies more now than we ever have before. This is the time to push, because perhaps a generation from now we will have transitioned into a lot of other kinds of fuel and gas and oil will not be so important and will not be so relevant any longer. It isn't just the gas and the oil and the fuel that comes from our crude oil, but it is all the other energy supplies out there.

Now, I understand that the other side of the aisle and the Pelosi plan is going to include some things like conservation, and I suspect reasonable conservation measures. I think it is awfully hard to legislate. I think the markets do more for that than we could probably do with legislation. Conservation is a component. But I would ask to put in your mind's eye the idea that I call the energy pie. The energy pie, shaped like a clock, for example, but slices of that pie, pieces of the pie, or the components of it would come from all of the areas where we get energy.

So I would submit that a certain percentage of our overall BTU consumption in America is gasoline. Some is diesel fuel. Some is fuel oil. Then those hydrocarbons that come from crude oil, and then, in addition to that, we have a lot of our electricity, significant amount comes from hydroelectric and nuclear and coal fired, especially clean coal fired, and we also, then, out of that energy, then, in addition to that, we have our ethanol, our biodiesel. We have hydrogen. There is a whole list of sources for energy in America, and we need to look at that, like all the BTUs consumed in America, a big energy pie, and then reprioritize that. Let us change the size of the pieces and grow the size of the energy pie.

I want more BTUs on the market. I want a lot more energy on the market. I want to go everywhere we can to get that energy and pour it into the marketplace and do it so that we can supply more BTUs than we are using.

If we can do that, we can drive down the cost of all energy. We need to do that by adding it by component by component. The ethanol, the biodiesel, more coal, more wind, I left that out,

the hydrogen, on the horizon, the cellulosic ethanol that is coming, piece after piece of this energy pie needs to be added together. Then we change the proportion of the pieces so that gasoline from middle eastern oil becomes a smaller piece, and diesel fuel from middle eastern oil becomes a smaller piece.

Ethanol becomes a larger piece. Biodiesel becomes a larger piece. Cellulosic down the line a half a decade from now can really start to take hold, and we can replace some of the electricity that is being generated by the natural gas with wind energy, and that is an environmentally friendly and conservation approach that is good for our environment.

All of these tools are at our disposal, but one of the tools we seem to use is we want to punish the corporations that are busily contributing to growing the size of the energy pie, and also diversifying some of their investments so they aren't just locked into the petroleum but adding the diversification out there, so that they can contribute also to adjusting the size of the pieces in this larger growing energy pie.

That is how this needs to be done. We need to be doing it by complimenting the companies that are competing in the open market, not by punishing them, not by defying the rules of free enterprise with Congressional action, not by changing the deal, not by jerking the rug out from underneath. I would suggest that there is a Chevron find in the Gulf of Mexico, I understand it is about 265 miles southwest of New Orleans, that may add as much as a 50 percent more to the overall reserves or the overall production of oil in the United States.

With that field opening up, and the necessity to open up in ANWR, we can, if we are aggressive, we can reduce dramatically our dependency on foreign oil, and then, of course, we add to that the renewable energies that I have talked about. We can get there. We will not get there if we scare our companies off, if we punish them for doing good and doing the right thing.

So I will move from that energy discussion and move to the discussion by the gentleman, Mr. ANDREWS, on Iran. I want to compliment him for the tone and the thoughtfulness and the constitutional discussion that he brought here to the floor. I have no doubt that he understands the Constitution, and he is correct when he says the power to declare a war is with this Congress constitutionally.

But, also, the commander in chief of our military is the President of the United States, and that is clear, and that is a constitutional principle that should not be challenged by this Congress. He is the commander in chief.

There is nothing in the Constitution that says Congress shall have the authority to declare a war and then micromanage every little operation of that war. Simply when Congress declares war, they say we send a message to all sovereign nations in the world

that we are at war with whichever sovereign nations may be the subject of that declaration.

That declaration shows the commitment of Congress to support our troops and their mission. I will say that again, to support our troops and their mission, and the lead troop is the commander in chief, the President of the United States, George W. Bush, who does call these shots.

Our founding fathers understood you cannot fight a war by committee, and you can't put your finger into the wind and ask the public to poll and ask how you should go about fighting a war. If we are going to sit here and say, well, the public polls say that the support for the operations in Iraq, the battleground of Iraq, which is a battleground in the broader global war on terror, if we are going to take the position that this Congress can steal the polls and make military recommendations or pass edicts here or take the budget and squeeze down our support for our troops or shut it off like they did at the end of the Vietnam War, that we can micromanage a war from the floor of the Congress?

It is a ridiculous concept, and it was a ridiculous concept for the President of the United States during the Vietnam War, to micromanage that war. President Johnson should have turned that over to his military personnel at the joint chiefs of staffs, who would have relied upon their commanders in the field. If they were not satisfied with those results, they would have changed them. It is the prerogative of the President to remove generals and appoint new generals.

Of course, the Senate confirms those higher appointments, as we saw happen a little over a week ago, with the confirmation of General David Petraeus.

Now, we find ourselves in this odd dichotomy here, this odd contradiction, where Congress has, and I am speaking, I should say specifically, the Senate has unanimously endorsed the President's choice to be the commander of all operations in Iraq, General David Petraeus.

Personally, I would put into the RECORD that he is the singular most impressive individual that I have met in a military uniform in my lifetime. I do not believe that there could be another choice. I do not believe that there could be a better choice to head up these operations in this new way forward in Iraq than General David Petraeus.

□ 1915

Not only does he understand the overall strategy, he has written the book on counterinsurgencies. He spent years in Iraq. I first met him over there in October of 2003 where he commanded the 101st Airborne that had gone in and liberated the region about three provinces and in the region of Mosul. And there, as I sat and received a briefing from him, I will tell this little anecdote about General Petraeus, that is, he started to give a briefing.

And it was in a way, a classical Powerpoint slide show, but a slide show of pictures, the reality of what had taken place there. And he had a cordless microphone.

Now I do not get very many briefings that last an hour and a half, unless I happen to be the one that is delivering them. But General Petraeus spoke for about an hour or a little more, and the battery went dead on his microphone. The moment before the battery went dead, he had picked up another microphone that was laying there, and without even breaking stride, laid the one down, picked the microphone up with the fresh battery in it, and proceeded to complete that briefing that lasted about 90 minutes.

He had the solution sitting there waiting for the problem. He used every single minute of the 90 minutes extraordinarily effectively. Not only did he talk about politics and tactics and the military deployment that they had there, the difficulties that they had faced, he talked about how he had called for elections in Mosul.

Mosul was liberated in late March 2003. They had elections there in May of 2003. And at the table later on the next day, I met with the new governor of Mosul and the vice-governor of Moss, one a Shiaa, one a Kurd. One might have been a Sunni and the other was a Kurd. But regardless, he had representatives from two different sectarian factions there, and then a business leader at the table who was proficient in English.

You could tell by the eye contact of those three men, they were a team that was working together. General Petraeus understood the military and the tactics, understands them better today than he did then, and he understood them very well then. He understands the politics. He understands the economics. And he studied this. It has been his focus, it has been his life. He loves his soldiers. I am looking forward to a completion of this mission in Iraq that will be I believe a successful mission.

Mr. ANDREWS spoke about Iran. I digressed a bit before I get to that point. I support his constitutional conclusion that Congress alone declares war. But I would submit, in addition to that statement, that the Commander in Chief calls the shots. We declare war, if that is what the situation calls for.

And then Congress shall not get in the way and micromanage the operations. No war by committee, Madam Speaker, and no interference here on the part of these Members of Congress, except if they have an issue then they can do, behind-the-doors oversight. They can have those conversations. The President's door is open to the leadership of this Congress. We know that.

If they have those kind of issues, they want to discuss, we have classified briefings here. There are plenty of opportunities for oversight. If not, you can ask for opportunities for oversight.

But to set up this Congress and to use the committees and use the committee chairs and the ranking members to somehow configure a way to bring in motions and micromanage a war is a guaranteed military debacle. There has never been a successful committee operation fighting a war in history, and there is no way that you can set a precedent here out of this Congress, especially as divided and as defeatist as it is on the majority side of the aisle.

It seems to me that the will to win this war runs a successful clear distinct victory that would be written by the historians as a distant victory, is not really something that is loved and anticipated by the people on the other side of the aisle. And this is not a stretch that comes out of my imagination, Madam Speaker. But it is simply an observation from in this Chamber, when the Commander in Chief gave his State of the Union Address last month, now when he spoke about committing to victory in Iraq, one-half of this Chamber stood in a thunderous standing ovation, and the other half of the Chamber, Madam Speaker, sat on their hands in silence, disgraceful silence.

Could they not know that our troops in the field have televisions in real time over there in Iraq and in Afghanistan, and in other parts where our troops are today, supporting our troops that are in the front lines? Could they not know that our commanders all the way down the line to the privates are watching this disgraceful lack of support? Their lives are on the line, and they will hear Members from this side of the aisle to a man and to a woman say, I support the troops. I support the troops. I support the troops.

And the question to follow is, what about their mission? Do you support their mission? And that is when you cannot get a question answer from hardly anybody on the Democratic side of the aisle. In fact, the Speaker herself declined to say yes to that point blank question sometime in December of last year.

She said it was not a matter of victory, it was a matter of managing. Well, they want to manage their way out of there, and I will submit that the rule of warfare is, victory goes to the side that is occupying the territory at the end of the war. You cannot lift people off with helicopters off a U.S. embassy in places like Saigon, and say, well, we really won the war, we tactically won the war, we did not lose a battle, we won, we left because we wanted to, it was kind of an asterisk that those things happened down there.

We tactically did win every battle. And our U.S. military performed courageously, heroically, and gloriously. And they need to be honored by every generation from here on out. But we did not win the battle of who stood on the terrain at the end.

And these enemies that we have in the Middle East are a philosophical enemy that goes deep back into history. And before I go deep back into

history, I will speak again to the Iranian issue of Mr. ANDREWS, which is, he criticized the regime of Iran. I agree with him. It is an unstable leader that they have. And they have some mullahs that seem to be directing the action of that unstable leader. So that cabal in the middle appears to me to be, from our view, from our Western civilization view, an irrational group of leaders.

He said the regime must never have a nuclear weapon. I agree, Mr. ANDREWS, 100 percent, they must never have a nuclear weapon. And yet we cannot go forward. He said we cannot go for a reckless premature action against Iran. I agree with that as well. It cannot be reckless, it cannot be premature.

But does anybody really think that we can make nice enough, talk nice enough, be reasonable enough and take our case to the Iranians and say somehow can we just put out an olive branch here, and have an open discussion and find out what our disagreements. Does anybody really think that Ahmadinejad or the mullahs would just then peacefully come to the table, and they could be reasoned into a position of giving up their nuclear weapons?

I mean, they came out yesterday, and their announcement was that they will continue to develop their nuclear weapons, and they say they have a right to do so. But does anybody believe that they can be talked out of them? I am wondering what it is about human nature that I see this so clearly that they have gone down this path, they will not let go, they will not give up.

Why does anybody on that side of the aisle, Madam Speaker, think that they can debate Ahmadinejad into giving up his nuclear missiles and his nuclear technology and ability, when I would ask them, how long has it been since you have seen anybody in this Congress change their mind because of the sheer force of a debate?

I mean, these are not so momentous a decision that we make, but we come down here on the floor. And how often can anyone point to a single time that they have said something that was so profound, so honest, so insightful that another Member said, I did not know that. I am on your side, I will switch my position, change my vote, I will be with you because you made sense.

It is so utterly rare in this Congress, why would the gentleman believe that we could send negotiators over to Iran, and they would say, well, it makes sense to me. We will just demolish all of that nuclear capability. We want to sign a peace treaty with you all. We will start trading and it will be a wonderful world again.

The reason that we have a problem there is because we have a fundamental philosophical disagreement and misunderstanding. This began in Iran when President Jimmy Carter's belief in supporting religious fundamentalists caused him to support the return of the Ayatollah and the demise of the Shaw in Iran.

And when that happened in 1979, that was the beginning of the hostile Iran. And it did not take very long before we saw 444 days, 52 American hostages paraded regularly in front of our television trying to humiliate the United States. And some believe that Ahmadinejad was part of that group, they think they have pictures that show him there, a kidnapper of American diplomats.

I do not know. I do not know if that is true or if it is not true. But he certainly was not opposed to that that we know. He is for the annihilation of Israel, the annihilation of the United States, these dictators tell us what they think, and often they follow through on the those actions.

And so, no, I do not trust the Iranian leadership, I do trust a lot of the Iranian people. And I would trust the Iranian people to capture their freedom if given the chance. I would paint this image in the mind's eye, Mr. Speaker, of all who might be contemplating this.

In the map you will see Iraq to the west and Afghanistan to the east. And right in the middle, linked together bordering the two countries is Iran.

Now, I will argue that Afghanistan today is a free country. And our troops were on the ground guarding the polling places. The first time ever in the history of the world that since Adam that there had been any votes that took place on that soil.

Today it is a fledgling democracy. It has its problems. Certainly it will. We had our problems in the early years. We have our problems today. It is never pretty. It is always difficult. But it is always worth the effort. But Afghanistan is a free country. Iraq is technically a free country today.

The part that diminishes that freedom is the 80 percent of the violence that takes place in Baghdad and within 30 miles of Baghdad. But Iraq, much of Iraq is peaceful, it is pacified and it is becoming prosperous. I went over there the last time, over the last Thanksgiving, I actually spent my Thanksgiving Day eating dinner with a good number of wounded troops in Landstuhl, Germany, at the hospital, and encouraged by their courage.

That was the most monumental and profound Thanksgiving that I have ever had or ever hope or expect to have. And from there, I traveled over to Iraq where I did spend a couple of days in the Baghdad area, and then I went to a camp, a forward operating base just out of Baghdad, and then on up into Erbil in the north, in the Kurdish area in the north.

I have been to most corners of Iraq over the last few years. I try to get there as often as I can to get a feel for what is going on. I do not think it is possible to understand that operation over there without going there. I was encouraged by the level of peace and the growing prosperity, especially that that I saw in Erbil and up in the Kurdish area.

You get out of the plane there, take off your flack jacket, toss your helmet

in the back, and walk across to the parliament. I sat down with some members of parliament there. And then they cooked also a turkey Thanksgiving dinner that was something that I have not seen done as well in this country. Gregarious hosts and wonderful people. That is how I find most of the Iraqi people.

I do not accept a 60-percent number that was delivered here by the gentleman from Georgia, that 60 percent of the Iraqis believe it is good or okay to be attacking Americans. I do not know where that poll would come from. Maybe if you polled the terrorists you would get a number like that.

But I do not believe, Madam Speaker, that that is the sentiment of the Iraqi people. The Iraqi people are grateful that the United States has stepped in to liberate them. There is a bit of a power vacuum, especially in Baghdad.

The President's plan is to go in and fill that power vacuum. Muqtada al-Sadr has done a job in filling that power vacuum. And he has been supported and funded and armed by Ahmadinejad's people in Iran. Iran is fighting a proxy war against the United States within Iraq.

You also have Syria fighting a lesser effective but to a lesser degree a proxy war against the United States in Iraq. When the President came out shortly after September 11, he said if you harbor terrorists, fund terrorists, train terrorists, you are a terrorist and we will treat you as a terrorist state.

□ 1930

Iran is one of those countries. Syria is one of those countries. I know of no example in the history of the world where an insurgency that could go back and hide and have sanctuary in a sovereign state has ever been defeated. You have to take your battle where the insurgency is. And if they have got a sanctuary you have to go to their sanctuary.

That doesn't mean that we need to take on Iran. It means that we have got to eliminate sanctuaries. And we cannot delude ourselves into believing that we can negotiate a nuclear capability away from Iran. It would be just utterly ineffective because they have a goal and they have a vision.

And from that point I would submit that the background here of United States history, American history, instructs us on what has been historically, and is relevant to today. Madam Speaker, I would submit that back in 1783 would be the period of time when the new United States made peace with Great Britain. And at that time, we had an American Merchant Marine that was sailing the world and trading. We have always been a very effective seafaring nation. And as our American Merchant Marine sailed and traded to the world and they went into the Mediterranean, up until 1783 they had the protection of the British Navy because we were, up until 1776, at least a colony of the British, and so we are now rectified of their Navy.

But when we were recognized by Britain and began to fly the American flag, and were not under the protection of the Union Jack, 1783, America made peace with Britain; and then, 1784, the first American ship was captured by pirates from Morocco. Thus began the Barbary wars where we took on the Barbary pirates. From 1784 and on up until about 1815, the United States was engaged sporadically and periodically, but actually almost continually in a war again the Barbary pirates along the Barbary Coast.

And before I go into that, Madam Speaker, I need to give a little bit more of the history of that region. Barbary pirates in that region had been raiding the Mediterranean shoreline, especially the European side of that, for years. And I will submit that they had been raiding the shoreline for almost 300 years at that point in 1784 when they captured the first American vessel.

Beginning about 1500, 1502, 1503 is when the Barbary pirates began an active and aggressive pirating of merchant marines that were sailing into the Mediterranean. And their goal was, capture the ship and the cargo and the crew. And the most valuable portion of that was all too often the crew, because they were pressed into slavery, Madam Speaker. And they brought back European slaves to the Barbary Coast where they pressed them into slavery.

And they built many of the edifices that you see there today, the old architecture from the 1500 era and on, clear on into the early 1800s, about 1830; much of that work was done by Christian slaves that were pressed into slavery by Muslim masters. And, in fact, there is a book written by a professor at Ohio State University called *Christian Slaves and Muslim Masters*. And he has gone back and studied the coastline, the European coastline of the Mediterranean and old church records and other family records and old family Bibles and put together a credible history of the slave trade by the Barbary pirates as they moved in with their corsairs and took over the merchant marine, the merchant ships from Europe.

The Barbary pirates raided the shoreline all around Greece and Italy and France and Spain and all the way up the coastline of France and the Atlantic into England and on over as far north as Iceland. In fact, there is a fairly detailed commentary about 400 Icelanders who were pulled from their beds at night just near the shore of Iceland, pressed into slavery and sailed back down to the Barbary Coast on the north shore of Africa.

And of all of the slaves that were captured along all of that coastline, from Greece all the way up to Iceland, these Icelanders survived the least, and they perished the most. They got the least amount of work out of them and they died the most quickly. And that happens to be some remarks that are written into the historical documents.

Some say it had to do with the climate change. Some say it had to do with the work they pressed them in. Some say it had to do with their hearts being utterly broken that they were pressed into slavery, and they just lost their will to live. But there is very little, if any, genetic remnant of those slaves today because the men that were pressed into slavery, and it was almost all men, they were never allowed an opportunity to do anything but walk in their chains and row the corsairs, or else do their slave labor, building the buildings and doing the kind of construction work that built those cities.

They didn't have an opportunity to procreate, so you don't see their genetics in the faces of the people that live on that part of the continent today. Occasionally, I am told that there are some blue eyes that pop up that look like they might be the descendants of the women who were captured aboard ship or offshore, who were pressed into, I will say concubinery.

And so there are some descendants from that, but it is very little, from remnants. But all together, Professor Davis documents about 1.25 million Christian slaves that were pressed into slavery by the Barbary pirates, and this period of time would be from about 1500 on to about 1583.

Well, it continued from that point forward, and Europe built a practice of paying tribute to the pirates and seeking to purchase back their most valuable citizens. And it would be those men and women of substance. If they had a wealthy family, then they would try to go and pay tribute to get that member of the family back. That went on for hundreds of years.

There was a pattern there. It was a business that was being run. And when the United States found themselves sucked into that in 1784 when our first ship was captured by the pirates from Morocco, that began the long conflict that lasted until at least 1815.

And one will remember that the United States took a posture eventually; we paid tribute here, Madam Speaker, out of this Congress to the Barbary pirates. And some of those line items that I have seen were as high as \$250,000 to pay tribute to the Barbary pirates, but that would be just one line item. And, in fact, that was a line item that was refused. But we paid more than that on an annual basis, and that tribute, that bribery got so high that it became as high as 20 percent of the entire Federal budget to pay off the pirates in the Barbary Coast.

And so we decided that we couldn't afford this any longer, and we had two alternatives. One was to outfit a Navy and a Marine Corps and send them over there to punish the Barbary pirates and get them to back off of any vessel that flew the Stars and Stripes. So we sent our best diplomats over there to negotiate with the Barbary pirates; and I don't know that we have diplomats of that standing today, but historically they will stand very high in

the mind's eye of Americans, Madam Speaker.

And so in 1786 Thomas Jefferson, who was then the ambassador to France, and John Adams, who was the ambassador to Britain, met in London with, and I don't have this name memorized, met in London with Sidi Haji Abdul Rahman Adja, the ambassador to Britain from Tripoli. Our American ambassadors, Jefferson and Adams, ambassadors to France and Britain respectively, asked Adja why his government was hostile to American ships, that even though there had been no provocation, his government was hostile to American ships. The ambassador's response was reported to the Continental Congress, and is a part of the permanent record today that can be reviewed over in the Library of Congress.

The response from Sidi Haji Abdul Rahman Adja, the ambassador to Britain from Tripoli, I will repeat, was this, and I quote, "It was founded on the laws of their prophet, that it was written in their Koran, that all nations who should not have acknowledged their authority were sinners, that it was their right and duty to make war upon them wherever they could be found and to make slaves of all they could take as prisoners, and that every Musselman," and that is the term for a Muslim today, "who should be slain in battle was sure to go to paradise."

Sound familiar, Madam Speaker, to some of the things that we hear today?

And Jefferson's analysis, his comments upon that valiant effort at diplomacy, an effort that has been suggested by Mr. ANDREWS here this evening, Jefferson's analysis was this, and I will paraphrase and summarize and not quote, but it is hard to reach common ground, it is hard to negotiate with people whose profound religious belief is that their salvation is from killing you.

1786; 2006-2007. We think we have come a long way; we may have not gained a single inch in this disagreement, just had some interim conflicts and relative periods of peace. I think the American people need to understand this.

And so out of the failure of that diplomatic effort, that valiant diplomatic effort, the United States Navy was born, March 1794. The Marine Corps joined with the Navy and they went to the shores of Tripoli. And that is today in the Marine Corps anthem, "From the halls of Montezuma, to the shores of Tripoli."

And our Navy was fitted, and they designed frigates for Americans, and these frigates had superior speed and superior maneuverability, very much an American thing. That was the first time that Americans went to war after the ratification of their Constitution, and they went to war with the most modern frigates that had a tactical advantage because the technology that was developed by the innovative nature and the inventiveness of American shipbuilders. And today we are off in

space with that same kind of innovation.

The Marines, when they went to the shores of Tripoli, they knew what they were up against to some degree.

And Madam Speaker, we have all heard Marines called Leathernecks. Most don't recall, Marines got the nickname Leathernecks because they put leather collars around their neck, thick leather collars when they went into battle to reduce the chance that they would be beheaded by the enemy. That is how Marines got the nickname Leathernecks. They got that nickname over 200 years ago, and it is part of their history and part of their lore. And the shores of Tripoli are engraved on their Iwo Jima monument over across the Potomac River.

And so we need to go back and revisit history, Madam Speaker, and understand that this enemy is driven by the same philosophy. They still believe their path to salvation is in killing us. There are passages in the Koran that support this almost verbatim that I have happened to have read.

Thomas Jefferson had a Koran. I understand that Koran came to this Congress to be used in a swearing-in ceremony. Some say that he leaned towards Islam because he owned a Koran. I will submit that Thomas Jefferson also studied Greek, and he had a Greek Bible; he wanted to be able to understand the passages in the Bible from the perspective of the Greek, rather than relying on the translations from Greek into an English version.

Thomas Jefferson was perhaps the preeminent scholar of his time, maybe the preeminent scholar in our history. He took his work seriously. Of course he needed to understand "nosce hostem," which is Latin for "know thy enemy." And that would absolutely be the reason why Thomas Jefferson acquired a Koran, so he could understand that enemy that said that it is written in their Koran that all nations who should not have acknowledged their authority were sinners, that it was their right and duty to make war upon them wherever they could be found, and to make slaves of all they could take as prisoners, and that every Muslim who should be slain in battle was sure to go to paradise.

What a promise to make. And when that is a profound religion, it is impossible to negotiate with. So what we did, we went to war against them, and over time put them in a position where they needed to sue for peace.

And I will submit also that Algiers came under attack from the British twice and the French once. And they didn't cease their attacks on Western Europe—I will say Western civilization and the shipping industry within the Mediterranean as a piracy approach, as a government policy. They didn't cease those attacks until 1830 when the French went in and occupied Algiers.

And so here we are today with an enemy, globally, in the world, which is a segment of Islam. And I certainly respect and appreciate moderate Islam. I

ask them to step forward and be our allies. I believe they are a peaceful people and a good-hearted people. And the more I travel and the more people I meet, the greater my respect and admiration for the goodness of humanity is.

But there is an element within Islam that is radical Islam, the jihadists, the Islamists, as Daniel Pipes has named them. That element is a significantly large element and there are maybe 1.2 to 1.3 billion Muslims in the world. And according to Daniel Pipes, our Benazir Bhutto, 10 percent, and according to Pipes, perhaps as many as 15 percent, are inclined to be supportive of al Qaeda.

Now, if it is 10 percent you are looking at 130 million. If it is 15 percent, add half again to that. That is a huge number of people who philosophically believe that their path to salvation is in killing us, and that they don't really take a risk with their destiny when they attack us because if they are killed in the process, they will surely go to paradise.

□ 1945

That is the enemy that we are against, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time I have left?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Eight minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. And so here we are today with a Congress that wants to micromanage a war, and a resolution or two or three over in the Senate that undermine our troops, and a resolution promise to come to the floor of this House next week that undermines our troops. As I have submitted, you cannot win a war by committee. You cannot fight a war by committee, but you can undermine the mission and you can put your troops at risk by doing so.

We have top-notch commanders in the field, Madam Speaker. They have demonstrated their ability. We have the best military ever put into the field. Their morale is strong, their technology is there, their training is high. Their sense of mission and duty and sacrifice is strong and is profound. They want to complete their mission.

I traveled over there with a lieutenant colonel who said to me, Don't pull us out of this. Don't save me. Don't save me. I volunteered. I am willing to take this risk. I want to take this burden off of my children. That is my duty to my country and to my family. I want to take this burden off my children. Don't try to save me.

I had some Gold Star families in my office a couple of months ago, shortly before I went to Iraq, Gold Star families who have lost a son or a daughter in combat over in either Afghanistan or Iraq. As I listened to them, they just intensely pleaded with me, Do everything you can to promote a successful mission. We have heard much of the dialogue, but to look them in the eye and understand that intensity. And then, one of the bereaved fathers from California, his first name was John,

said to me, It's different now. Our children have gone over there and fought and died on that soil. The soil in Iraq is sanctified by their blood. They paid their price for the freedom of the Iraqi people. You cannot walk away and leave that now. That is the vision of the Gold Star families. That is the commitment of our military.

I can't find people in uniform in Iraq that don't support the mission, that aren't committed to the cause. But they ask me, why do we have to fight the enemy over here, the news media over in the United States, and the people that are undermining us in the United States Congress? It is an undermining. And I will make this prediction, Madam Speaker, that before this 110th Congress is adjourned, there will be an amendment or a bill that comes to this floor that seeks to unfund our military, one that is written off the pattern of the one at the end of Vietnam. And if that amendment comes and it is successful and it shuts off funding and our troops are forced by a defeatist attitude in Congress to pull out of Iraq, you will see a human suffering like this world has not seen since World War II.

The price for failing to succeed will be cataclysmic. I don't have enough minutes to go into the description of all of that.

But I will submit that we either succeed victoriously and leave Iraq a free democratic Iraq that can stand on its own two feet and defend itself and be represented by its people, we either do that, or the last battle in Iraq won't be fought over there, Madam Speaker. It will be fought here on the floor of this Congress through an appropriations bill that will seek to jerk the rug out from underneath our sacrificing military. And it would put this country in utter disgrace if that were to happen.

So I have introduced a resolution, a resolution that supports and endorses our troops, one that recognizes the circumstances that we are in, the constitutional power and authority of our Commander in Chief, and stands up and defends our troops and our military all the way down the line. It says, in fact, the bipartisan Iraq Study Group says on page 73 that it could support a short-term redeployment or surge of American combat forces to stabilize Baghdad or to speed up the training and equipping mission if the U.S. commander in Iraq determines that such steps would be effective.

General Petraeus has written the plan. He has determined it would be effective; it is consistent with the Iraq Study Group, page 73. Look it up. General Petraeus has endorsed the plan, as I said. And on top of that, the cochair of the Iraq Study Group, former Secretary of State James Baker III, came back to this Congress and said: The President's plan ought to be given a chance. He wants us to support the Iraq Study Group, and that is the President's plan. That means a free and liberated Iraq, not a cut and run.

Honor the troops for their service and honor their mission, and in fact honor their sacrifice. And I will fight this battle here where it is at greatest risk, Madam Speaker. And I urge my colleagues to do the same.

I look forward to the debate next week and the open dialogue, and I hope that there is a rule that is offered here under the promise of this new and open Congress that would allow for amendments to be brought to the floor so that resolutions of this type actually have an opportunity to be debated in this Congress.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of business in the district.

Mr. DEFAZIO (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today after 4:00 p.m.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PALLONE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SCHIFF, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ELLISON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KLEIN of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ANDREWS, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CARNAHAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RUSH, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. POE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. POE, for 5 minutes, February 13, 14, and 15.

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SOUDER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PENCE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCHENRY, for 5 minutes, today.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 53 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the

House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, February 9, 2007, at 2 p.m.

### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

545. A letter from the Administrator, AMS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Milk in the Northeast and Other Marketing Areas; Interim Order Amending the Orders [Docket No. AO-14-A74, et al.; DA-06-01] received January 25, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

546. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, APHIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Pine Shoot Beetle; Additions to Quarantined Areas [Docket No. APHIS-2006-0117] received January 17, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

547. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, APHIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Tuberculosis in Cattle and Bison; State and Zone Designations; Texas [Docket No. APHIS-2006-0145] received December 29, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

548. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, APHIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Mediterranean Fruit Fly; Remove Portions of Los Angeles, San Bernadino, and Santa Clara Counties, CA From the List of Quarantined Areas [Docket No. APHIS-2005-0116] received January 10, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

549. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, APHIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — National Poultry Improvement Plan and Auxiliary Provisions [Docket No. APHIS-2006-0008] (RIN: 0579-AC27) received January 12, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

550. A letter from the Under Secretary, Food, Nutrition and Consumer Services, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Senior Farmers' Market Nutrition Program Regulations (RIN: 0584-AD35) received December 29, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

551. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Thiabendazole; Pesticide Tolerance for Emergency Exemptions [EPA-HQ-OPP-2006-0962; FRL-8111-1] received January 26, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

552. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Tris(2-ethylhexyl) Phosphate; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2006-0970; FRL-8112-2] received February 2, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

553. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Avermectin; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions [EPA-HQ-OPP-2006-0918; FRL-8110-8] received February 2, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

554. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Spiromesifen; Pesticide Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2006-0667; FRL-8110-3] received January 19, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

555. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations — received February 1, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

556. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations — received February 1, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

557. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Changes in Flood Determinations [Docket No. FEMA-B-7703] received February 1, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

558. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Determinations — received February 1, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

559. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Public Record Grant Guidelines for States; Solid Waste Disposal Act, Subtitle I, as amended by Title XV, Subtitle B of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 [FRL-8274-1] received January 26, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

560. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Financial Responsibility and Installer Certification Grant Guidelines for States; Solid Waste Disposal Act, Subtitle I, as amended by Title XV, Subtitle B of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 [FRL-8274-2] received January 26, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

561. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Virginia; Emission Standards for Consumer Products in the Northern Virginia Volatile Organic Compound Emissions Control Area [EPA-R03-OAR-2005-VA-0017; FRL-8273-9] received January 26, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

562. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Michigan; Control of Gasoline Volatility [EPA-R05-OAR-2006-0547; FRL-8274-4] received January 26, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

563. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of Utah; Administrative Procedures [EPA-R08-OAR-2005-UT-0007; FRL-8275-2] received February 2, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

564. A letter from the Chief, Trade and Commercial Regulations Branch, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Conditional Release Period and CBP Bond Obligations for Food, Drugs, Devices, and Cosmetics (RIN: 1505-AB57) received January 7, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

565. A letter from the Chief, Trade and Commercial Regulations Branch, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Fees for Certain Services (RIN: 1505-AB62) received January 25, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. BILBRAY:

H.R. 909. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act and the Beaches Environmental Assessment and Coastal Health Act of 2000 to authorize appropriations for activities to improve the quality of coastal recreation waters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 910. A bill to amend the Trade Act of 1974 to make certain modifications to the trade adjustment assistance program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WEINER:

H.R. 911. A bill to authorize the grant program under which the Secretary of Homeland Security makes discretionary grants for use in high-threat, high-density urban areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. FARR (for himself, Mr. BACA, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. COSTA, Mr. FILNER, Mr. GILCHREST, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, and Mr. SALAZAR):

H.R. 912. A bill to provide additional funds for food safety research related to perishable agricultural commodities, to provide emergency financial assistance to producers and first handlers of fresh spinach for losses incurred as a result of the removal of fresh spinach and products containing fresh spinach from the market and other actions undertaken in response to a public health advisory regarding spinach issued by the Food and Drug Administration in September 2006, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS (for himself, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, and Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida):

H.R. 913. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a credit against tax for hurricane and tornado mitigation expenditures; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin (for himself, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. SESSIONS):

H.R. 914. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow individuals a refundable credit against income tax for the purchase of private health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HINOJOSA (for himself, Mr. REYES, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GOHMERT, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. PAS-TOR, Mr. BACA, Mr. BECERRA, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ,

Mr. BURGESS, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. WILSON of Ohio, Mr. GORDON, and Mr. SCOTT of Georgia);

H.R. 915. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 110 East Alexander Street in Three Rivers, Texas, as the "Veterans Memorial Post Office"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. SCOTT of Georgia (for himself, Mr. GORDON, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. MCCOTTER, Ms. LEE, Ms. DELAURO, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. NADLER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. ELLISON, and Mr. CONYERS);

H.R. 916. A bill to provide for loan repayment for prosecutors and public defenders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYES (for himself, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. MCINTYRE, Ms. HERSETH, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. GOODE, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. GOHMERT, Ms. FOX, Mr. COBLE, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. WAMP);

H.R. 917. A bill to prohibit the Department of Homeland Security from procuring certain items directly related to the national security unless the items are grown, reprocessed, reused, or produced in the United States; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. CARNAHAN:

H.R. 918. A bill to provide for the construction, operation, and maintenance of a connector road in Lemay, Missouri; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. WICKER, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. GOODE, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, and Mr. PENCE);

H.R. 919. A bill to amend section 1951 of title 18, United States Code (commonly known as the Hobbs Act), and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAYLOR (for himself, Ms. WATERS, Mr. JINDAL, Mr. MELANCON, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. BONNER, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. CLAY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee, and Mr. ALEXANDER);

H.R. 920. A bill to amend the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 to provide for the national flood insurance program to make available multiperil coverage for damage resulting from windstorms or floods, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. MATSUI (for herself, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. NORTON, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mr. SHIMKUS);

H.R. 921. A bill to authorize the Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to make grants to communities to be used for outreach efforts to encourage participation in the national flood insurance program; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. MATSUI (for herself and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts);

H.R. 922. A bill to provide for a study by the General Accounting Office on methods, practices, and incentives to increase the extent to which low-income property owners living in high-risk locations participate in the National Flood Insurance Program; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia (for himself, Mr. HULSHOF, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. WATT, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. WATERS, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. CLAY, Ms. LEE, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Ms. WATSON, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. WYNN, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. RUSH, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. CARSON, Mr. HONDA, Ms. NORTON, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BECERRA, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. NADLER, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. COHEN, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Ms. CASTOR);

H.R. 923. A bill to establish an Unsolved Crimes Section in the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice, and an Unsolved Civil Rights Crime Investigative Office in the Civil Rights Unit of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself, Mr. BAKER, Mr. McCRERY, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. JINDAL, Mr. JEFFERSON, and Mr. MELANCON);

H.R. 924. A bill to require the Food and Drug Administration to permit the sale of baby turtles as pets so long as the seller uses proven methods to effectively treat salmonella; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. NUNES (for himself, Mr. COSTA, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. FILNER, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. LANTOS, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. SOLIS, Ms. WATSON, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. BACA, Mr. HONDA, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. HARMAN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Ms. MATSUI);

H.R. 925. A bill to provide emergency agricultural disaster assistance for agricultural producers, manufacturers, and workers in the State of California, to appropriate funds for Pacific salmon emergency disaster assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committees on the Budget, Natural Resources, and Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. HERSETH (for herself, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. BOYD of Florida, Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. KING of

Iowa, Mr. KUCINICH, and Ms. WATERS);

H.R. 926. A bill to prohibit the provision of Federal economic development assistance for any State or locality that uses the power of eminent domain power to obtain property for private commercial development or that fails to pay relocation costs to persons displaced by use of the power of eminent domain for economic development purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, Financial Services, Natural Resources, and Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 927. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the credit for biodiesel used as a fuel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COOPER:

H.R. 928. A bill to amend the Inspector General Act of 1978 to enhance the independence of the Inspectors General, to create a Council of the Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. COSTELLO (for himself, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. RUSH, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. KIRK, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. WELLER, Mr. HARE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. BEAN, Mr. MANZULLO, and Mr. ROSKAM);

H.R. 929. A bill to establish the Land Between the Rivers National Heritage Area in the State of Illinois, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas:

H.R. 930. A bill to recognize the extraordinary performance of the Armed Forces in achieving the military objectives of the United States in Iraq, to terminate the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002 (Public Law 107-243), to require congressional reauthorization to continue deployment of the Armed Forces to Iraq, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COSTELLO (for himself, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. LAHOOD, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. HARE, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. ROSS, and Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania);

H.R. 931. A bill to provide for the research, development, and demonstration of coal gasification technology as an energy source in ethanol production; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

By Mr. CROWLEY (for himself, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. HINCHAY, Mr. McNULTY, and Ms. BERKLEY);

H.R. 932. A bill to amend part D of title XVIII of the Social Security Act to limit the monthly amount of prescription drug cost-sharing for full-benefit dual eligible individuals and other lowest-income individuals under the Medicare prescription drug program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as

fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CUMMINGS (for himself, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. LEE, and Mr. PAYNE):

H.R. 933. A bill to establish within the United States Marshals Service a short term State witness protection program to provide assistance to State and local district attorneys to protect their witnesses in cases involving homicide, serious violent felonies, and serious drug offenses, and to provide Federal grants for such protection; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee (for himself and Mr. BUTTERFIELD):

H.R. 934. A bill to amend section 218 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to modify the method of calculating the wages to be paid to H-2A workers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee:

H.R. 935. A bill to insert certain counties as part of the Appalachian Region; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. DINGELL (for himself, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. UPTON, Mr. RUSH, Mr. STEARNS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. GORDON, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. DEGETTE, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. DOYLE, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. INSLEE, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. HOOLEY, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. TERRY, Mr. BURGESS, and Mr. ENGEL):

H.R. 936. A bill to prohibit fraudulent access to telephone records; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. SHUSTER, and Mrs. BLACKBURN):

H.R. 937. A bill to withhold United States contributions to the United Nations Development Program; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GINGREY (for himself, Mr. GOODE, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. AKIN, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, and Mr. DUNCAN):

H.R. 938. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to make changes related to family-sponsored immigrants and to reduce the number of such immigrants; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOODE:

H.R. 939. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense to assign members of the regular or reserve components of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps, under certain circumstances and subject to certain conditions, to assist the Department of Homeland Security in the performance of border protection functions; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HERGER:

H.R. 940. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the use of interstate commerce for suicide promotion; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois:

H.R. 941. A bill to authorize the conveyance of a portion of the campus of the Illiana Health Care System of the Department of Veterans Affairs to Danville Area Community College of Vermilion County, Illinois; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 942. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to clarify certain provisions in the national emission standards for hazardous air pollutants to ensure that no major stationary sources of such air pollutants are exempted by Environmental Protection Agency rules from compliance with the maximum achievable control technology standard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut (for himself, Mr. EMANUEL, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. HOLT, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. KUHL of New York, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. WYNN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. WEINER, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. HARE, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. ROTHMAN, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. BACA, Mr. GORDON, Mr. CAMP of Michigan, Mr. COHEN, Mr. SIREN, Mr. SPACE, Mr. ELLSWORTH, Mr. WILSON of Ohio, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. KAGEN, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. SESTAK, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. HALL of New York, and Mr. SHULER):

H.R. 943. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from income and employment taxes and wage withholding property tax rebates and other benefits provided to volunteer firefighters and emergency medical responders; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LOBIONDO (for himself, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

H.R. 944. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of the Interior from issuing oil and gas leases on portions of the Outer Continental Shelf located off the coast of New Jersey; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. ROTHMAN, and Mr. WAXMAN):

H.R. 945. A bill to require the Food and Drug Administration to conduct consumer testing to determine the appropriateness of the current labeling requirements for indoor tanning devices and determine whether such requirements provide sufficient information to consumers regarding the risks that the use of such devices pose for the development of irreversible damage to the skin, including skin cancer, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Ms. CARSON):

H.R. 946. A bill to extend the protections of the Truth in Lending Act to overdraft protection programs and services provided by depository institutions, to require customer consent before a depository institution may initiate overdraft protection services and fees, to enhance the information made available to consumers relating to overdraft protection services and fees, to prohibit systematic manipulation in the posting of checks and other debits to a depository account for the purpose of generating overdraft protec-

tion fees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas):

H.R. 947. A bill to empower women in Afghanistan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. RUSH, Mr. STEARNS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. GORDON, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. DEGETTE, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. DOYLE, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. INSLEE, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. HOOLEY, Mr. WEINER, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. TERRY, Mr. BURGESS, and Mr. ENGEL):

H.R. 948. A bill to strengthen the authority of the Federal Government to protect individuals from certain acts and practices in the sale and purchase of Social Security numbers and Social Security account numbers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. McDERMOTT:

H.R. 949. A bill to extend Federal recognition to the Duwamish Tribe, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. PLATTS:

H.R. 950. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to study the suitability and feasibility of designating Camp Security, located in Springettsbury, York County, Pennsylvania, as a unit of the National Park System; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. PLATTS:

H.R. 951. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to suspend the running of periods of limitation for credit or refund of overpayment of Federal income tax by veterans while their service-connected compensation determinations are pending with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PLATTS:

H.R. 952. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for an enhanced deduction for qualified residence interest on acquisition indebtedness for heritage homes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PLATTS (for himself and Mr. MATHESON):

H.R. 953. A bill to repeal the provision of law that provides automatic pay adjustments for Members of Congress; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 954. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 365 West 125th Street in New York, New York, as the "Percy Sutton Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. REHBERG:

H.R. 955. A bill to respond to the illegal production, distribution, and use of methamphetamines in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to

the Committees on Agriculture, Natural Resources, Transportation and Infrastructure, Education and Labor, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RENZI (for himself, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, and Mr. MATHESON):

H.R. 956. A bill to repeal section 10(f) of Public Law 93-531, commonly known as the "Bennett Freeze"; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. PENCE, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. POE, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. FALOMAVAEGA, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. KLEIN of Florida):

H.R. 957. A bill to amend the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 to expand and clarify the entities against which sanctions may be imposed; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, Ways and Means, and Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RUSH (for himself, Mr. STEARNS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. GORDON, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. DEGETTE, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. DOYLE, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. INSLEE, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. HOOLEY, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. HASTERT, Mrs. BONO, Mr. TERRY, Mr. BURGESS, and Mr. ENGEL):

H.R. 958. A bill to protect consumers by requiring reasonable security policies and procedures to protect computerized data containing personal information, and to provide for nationwide notice in the event of a security breach; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SAXTON:

H.R. 959. A bill to expand a Department of Defense survivor annuity program that covers unremarried surviving spouses of certain members of the uniformed services who died before October 1, 1978, to include any otherwise eligible surviving spouse who remarries after age 55 or whose remarriage before age 55 is terminated; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SESTAK (for himself, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, and Mr. COHEN):

H.R. 960. A bill to enhance the national security interests of the United States both at home and abroad by setting a deliberate timetable for the redeployment of United States Armed Forces from Iraq by December 31, 2007, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SHUSTER (for himself and Mr. HOLDEN):

H.R. 961. A bill to protect American workers and responders by ensuring the continued commercial availability of respirators and to establish rules governing product liability actions against manufacturers and sellers of respirators; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER:

H.R. 962. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to preserve the effectiveness of medically important antibiotics used in the treatment of human and animal diseases; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. STUPAK:

H.R. 963. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide that the rate of reimbursement for motor vehicle travel under the beneficiary travel program of the Department of Veterans Affairs shall be the same as the rate for private vehicle reimbursement for Federal employees; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TOWNS (for himself, Mrs. BONO, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. RUSH, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. GORDON, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. DEGETTE, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. DOYLE, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. INSLEE, Ms. HOOLEY, Mr. WEINER, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. TERRY, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. BURGESS, and Mr. ENGEL):

H.R. 964. A bill to protect users of the Internet from unknowing transmission of their personally identifiable information through spyware programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. UDALL of Colorado:

H.R. 965. A bill to amend the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Technical Education Act of 1998 to modify the definition of "Indian student count"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. UDALL of Colorado:

H.R. 966. A bill to amend the Indian Financing Act of 1974 to provide for sale and assignment of loans and underlying security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. UDALL of Colorado:

H.R. 967. A bill to establish the treatment of actual rental proceeds from leases of land acquired under an Act providing for loans to Indian tribes and tribal corporations; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. UDALL of Colorado:

H.R. 968. A bill to amend the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act to modify provisions relating to the National Fund for Excellence in American Indian Education; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. UDALL of New Mexico (for himself, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. SHAYS, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Mr. DOGGETT):

H.R. 969. A bill to amend title VI of the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 to establish a Federal renewable energy portfolio standard for certain retail electric utilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. UPTON (for himself and Mr. LARSEN of Washington):

H.R. 970. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to the distribution of the drug dextromethorphan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WEINER (for himself and Mr. MORAN of Kansas):

H.R. 971. A bill to ensure and foster continued patient safety and quality of care by making the antitrust laws apply to negotia-

tions between groups of independent pharmacies and health plans and health insurance issuers (including health plans under parts C and D of the Medicare Program) in the same manner as such laws apply to protected activities under the National Labor Relations Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WEXLER (for himself, Mr. FILLNER, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, and Mr. GONZALEZ):

H.R. 972. A bill to provide compensation to individuals who, during the Vietnam conflict, were employees of the Federal Government or contractor employees of the Department of Defense and suffered disability or death from exposure to Agent Orange; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLF:

H.R. 973. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow physicians a credit against income tax for providing charity care; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PLATTS:

H.J. Res. 24. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to limit the number of consecutive terms that a Member of Congress may serve; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee:

H. Con. Res. 61. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the United States flag flown over the United States Capitol should be lowered to half-mast one day each month in honor of the brave men and women from the United States who have lost their lives in military conflicts; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia:

H. Con. Res. 62. Concurrent resolution supporting the goals and ideals of a National Children and Families Day, in order to encourage adults in the United States to support and listen to children and to help children throughout the Nation achieve their hopes and dreams, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. EMANUEL:

H. Res. 139. A resolution electing Members to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia:

H. Res. 140. A resolution requesting the Secretary of Defense to remove members of the United States Armed Forces from street patrol duty in Iraq; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. COLE of Oklahoma (for himself, Mr. BOREN, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. SULLIVAN, and Ms. FALLIN):

H. Res. 141. A resolution congratulating Miss Lauren Nelson for being crowned Miss America and thanking the participants in and supporters of the Miss America Competition for their contributions to young women's lives and communities; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas:

H. Res. 142. A resolution honoring the life and accomplishments of Kevin Dwayne Ener, a dedicated radio broadcaster who worked diligently to provide valuable broadcast services to the Acres Homes Communities in Houston, Texas; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California (for herself, Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. SNYDER, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, and Ms. SCHWARTZ):

H. Res. 143. A resolution urging the President to appoint a Special Envoy for Middle East Peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas (for herself, Ms. CARSON, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Ms. KILPATRICK, and Ms. NORTON):

H. Res. 144. A resolution honoring the life and accomplishments of Arva "Marie" Johnson, a pioneer in the United States Capitol Police Department when she became the first African-American female to wear the uniform of the United States Capitol Police Department; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GONZALEZ (for himself, Mr. BACA, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MARSHALL, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. PAUL, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Mr. RODRIGUEZ):

H. Res. 145. A resolution recognizing the public service of Archbishop Patrick Flores; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas (for herself and Mrs. CAPPS):

H. Res. 146. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States should take action to meet its obligations, and to ensure that all other member states of the United Nations meet their obligations, to women as agreed to in United Nations Security Council Resolution 1325 relating to women, peace, and security, and the United States should fully assume the implementation of international law relating to human rights that protects the rights of women and girls during and after conflicts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KING of Iowa (for himself, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. HENSARLING, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. PENCE, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. SALI, Mr. SAXTON, and Mr. RADANOVICH):

H. Res. 147. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States is committed to victory in the global War on Terror and committed to victory on that battlefield in the War on Terror that is Iraq; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. RUSH, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. WATSON, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SPACE, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. MCCOTTER, and Mrs. DRAKE):

H. Res. 148. A resolution recognizing and appreciating the historical significance and the heroic human endeavor and sacrifice of the people of Crete during World War II and commending the PanCretan Association of America; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY (for herself, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mrs. CAPPS, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Ms. FALLIN, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BOSWELL, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of

Florida, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. COSTA, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. FARR, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HONDA, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. KIRK, Mr. LAHOOD, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEVIN, Mrs. LOWEY, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MANZULLO, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. REYES, Mr. RUSH, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SIREs, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. SOLIS, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. WATSON, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. WHITFIELD, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. WU, and Mr. WYNN):

H. Res. 149. A resolution supporting the goals of International Women's Day; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SHADEGG (for himself, Mr. WAMP, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. PITTS, Mr. AKIN, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. PENCE, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. WALBERG, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky):

H. Res. 150. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the Commander of Multinational Forces-Iraq and all United States personnel under his command should receive from Congress the full support necessary to carry out the United States mission in Iraq; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi:

H. Res. 151. A resolution recognizing and honoring York for his role in the Lewis and Clark Expedition; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mrs. NAPOLITANO:

H.R. 974. A bill to authorize and request the President to award the Medal of Honor to Joseph T. Getherall, of Hacienda Heights, California, for acts of valor in the Republic of Vietnam on December 22, 1966, while serving in the Marine Corps during the Vietnam War; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PLATTs:

H.R. 975. A bill for the relief of certain aliens who were aboard the Golden Venture; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 17: Mr. ARCURI, Mr. SHULER, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. POE, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. HIRANO, Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. ROTHMAN.

H.R. 19: Mr. BACHUS.

H.R. 25: Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. HUNTER, and Mr. BAKER.

H.R. 40: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 60: Mr. MAHONEY of Florida and Mr. HALL of Texas.

H.R. 66: Mr. GOODE.

H.R. 73: Mr. ALEXANDER, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mrs. CUBIN, Mrs. DRAKE, and Mr. HALL of Texas.

H.R. 87: Mr. REICHERT.

H.R. 89: Mr. BURTON of Indiana and Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia.

H.R. 111: Mr. HARE, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. KIRK, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. PEARCE, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 136: Mr. CAMPBELL of California.

H.R. 137: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 154: Mr. GERLACH.

H.R. 180: Mr. DELAHUNT and Ms. WATSON.

H.R. 197: Mr. REICHERT, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. LOBIONDO, and Mr. MANZULLO.

H.R. 210: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 219: Mr. COLE of Oklahoma.

H.R. 232: Mrs. MUSGRAVE.

H.R. 260: Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. GILCHREST, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. PETRI, Mr. KUHLMAN of New York, Mr. UPTON, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, and Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 270: Mr. PORTER.

H.R. 277: Mr. DOGGETT.

H.R. 289: Mr. SOUDER, Mr. AKIN, and Mr. MCCOTTER.

H.R. 303: Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. WAMP, Mr. TIERNEY, Mrs. CAPPS, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey.

H.R. 321: Mr. GERLACH, Mr. KUHLMAN of New York, and Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 333: Mr. LAHOOD, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. HOLDEN.

H.R. 343: Mr. GOODE.

H.R. 351: Mr. FATTAH.

H.R. 353: Mr. LOEBsACK.

H.R. 358: Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. MITCHELL, and Mr. McHUGH.

H.R. 359: Ms. WOOLSEY and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 368: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 394: Mr. DICKS, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, and Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois.

H.R. 402: Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas, Mr. GOODE, and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.

H.R. 418: Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.

H.R. 432: Mr. SALI, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. MICA, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, and Mrs. CAPITO.

H.R. 471: Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico, Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. MACK, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. POE, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. CANTOR, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, and Mr. KUHLMAN of New York.

H.R. 473: Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey.

H.R. 477: Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. CASTLE, and Mr. DUNCAN.

H.R. 500: Mr. WESTMORELAND.

H.R. 506: Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. KUHLMAN of New York, Mrs. MYRICK, and Mr. HALL of Texas.

H.R. 507: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. TIBERI, and Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 508: Mr. GUTIERREZ.  
H.R. 539: Mr. McCAUL of Texas, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. McHUGH, Mr. REICHERT, Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. McCOTTER, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. SHUSTER, Ms. FOXX, Mr. PETRI, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.  
H.R. 542: Mr. FILNER.  
H.R. 545: Mr. GUTIERREZ.  
H.R. 549: Ms. HARMAN.  
H.R. 552: Mr. GORDON, Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. GERLACH, and Mrs. CAPPs.  
H.R. 556: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. DICKS, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, and Mr. SMITH of Washington.  
H.R. 562: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, and Mr. ALEXANDER.  
H.R. 563: Mr. DOOLITTLE and Mr. LAMBORN.  
H.R. 567: Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.  
H.R. 579: Ms. KILPATRICK, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. REYES, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. ROSS, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. FORBES, Mr. HOLT, Ms. HERSETH, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, and Mr. BACA.  
H.R. 620: Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. SESTAK, and Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California.  
H.R. 621: Mr. FOSSELLA, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. FORTUÑO, Mr. PORTER, and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.  
H.R. 625: Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, and Mr. STARK.  
H.R. 628: Mr. TIBERI, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. TERRY, and Ms. HIRONO.  
H.R. 632: Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. McCOTTER, and Mr. HARE.  
H.R. 633: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.  
H.R. 634: Mr. FATTAH, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. REYES, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS.  
H.R. 635: Mr. KUHl of New York and Mr. TERRY.  
H.R. 636: Mr. BUYER, Mr. McHUGH, Mr. HAYES, Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. SALI, and Mr. BOOZMAN.  
H.R. 642: Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. BONNER, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. SUTTON, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.  
H.R. 645: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.  
H.R. 648: Mr. MELANCON, Mr. BONNER, Mr. McCOTTER, and Mr. PLATTS.  
H.R. 654: Ms. WATSON, Mr. BERRY, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. LAHOOD, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. HARMAN, Ms. CARSON, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. PAYNE.  
H.R. 657: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, and Mr. CLAY.  
H.R. 661: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.  
H.R. 662: Mr. FORTUÑO and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.  
H.R. 677: Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee, Ms. KILPATRICK, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 678: Ms. SCHWARTZ and Mr. CONYERS.  
H.R. 686: Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. SHAYS, and Mr. LOBIONDO.  
H.R. 687: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas and Mr. McNULTY.  
H.R. 690: Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky.  
H.R. 694: Ms. NORTON and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.  
H.R. 697: Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, and Mr. FORBES.  
H.R. 698: Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. GILCREST, and Mr. WOLF.  
H.R. 701: Mr. HARE and Mr. RUSH.  
H.R. 711: Mrs. MYRICK and Mr. WALZ of Minnesota.  
H.R. 713: Mr. BISHOP of New York and Mr. KING of New York.  
H.R. 714: Mrs. JONES of Ohio.  
H.R. 720: Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. DINGELL, and Mr. HALL of New York.  
H.R. 721: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CARTER, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. RAMSTAD.  
H.R. 725: Mr. MARCHANT and Mr. WESTMORELAND.  
H.R. 727: Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. McNULTY, Mrs. CAPPs, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. SHAYS, and Mr. GRIJALVA.  
H.R. 736: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.  
H.R. 740: Mr. BOUCHER, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Mr. SHERMAN.  
H.R. 746: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.  
H.R. 748: Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. WOLF, Mr. BISHOP of New York, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.  
H.R. 758: Mr. WATT.  
H.R. 779: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.  
H.R. 780: Mr. ROSS.  
H.R. 782: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. McNERNEY, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. McCOTTER, Mr. DUNCAN, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.  
H.R. 784: Mr. FATTAH.  
H.R. 787: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Mr. WELCH of Vermont, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. CARNEY, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. STARK, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. BACA, Mr. DUNCAN, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. PAYNE, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.  
H.R. 790: Ms. BORDALLO and Mr. MARSHALL.  
H.R. 797: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. KILPATRICK, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, and Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida.  
H.R. 800: Mr. BERRY.  
H.R. 811: Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, and Ms. BALDWIN.  
H.R. 814: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.  
H.R. 822: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.  
H.R. 826: Mr. GOODE.  
H.R. 851: Mr. FORBES.  
H.R. 854: Ms. NORTON and Mr. PAYNE.  
H.R. 897: Mr. SHAYS, Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, and Mr. WELCH of Vermont.

H.J. Res. 14: Mr. CLAY.  
H. Con. Res. 7: Mr. MORAN of Virginia.  
H. Con. Res. 40: Mr. SAXTON, Mr. TIBERI, and Mr. REGULA.  
H. Con. Res. 43: Mr. ALLEN.  
H. Con. Res. 45: Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia.  
H. Con. Res. 49: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. FORTUÑO, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. MATHESON, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. TANNER, Mr. DOYLE, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. WALSH of New York, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. WELLER, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. FOXX, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. GOODE, Mr. KIRK, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. FILNER, Mr. HOLT, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, and Mr. BUYER.  
H. Res. 18: Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky.  
H. Res. 37: Mr. RODRIGUEZ.  
H. Res. 42: Mr. COHEN, Mr. HOLT, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Ms. CARSON, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BACA, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. NORTON, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. FATTAH, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. LEE, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. SRES, Mrs. CAPPs, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Ms. WATSON, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.  
H. Res. 53: Mr. AKIN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. JEFFERSON, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. POE, Mr. GOHMERT, and Mr. MORAN of Kansas.  
H. Res. 55: Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. HARE, and Mr. MCGOVERN.  
H. Res. 97: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.  
H. Res. 100: Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. NADLER, and Ms. BALDWIN.  
H. Res. 101: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. McNERNEY, and Ms. BORDALLO.  
H. Res. 106: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. WALSH of New York, Mr. WU, Mr. MARCHANT, Ms. HARMAN, and Mr. MICHAUD.  
H. Res. 107: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. NADLER, Mr. WOLF, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Ms. FOXX, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. HOLT.  
H. Res. 117: Mr. EHLERS, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. UPTON, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. DENT, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. KUHl of New York, Mr. SESTAK, Mr. FATTAH, and Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia.  
H. Res. 119: Mr. PASTOR, Mrs. CUBIN, Ms. SOLIS, and Ms. NORTON.  
H. Res. 123: Mr. PLATTS and Mr. ISRAEL.  
H. Res. 135: Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. WATT, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. FORBES, Mr. COHEN, Mr. WYNN, Ms. CLARKE, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Mr. RANGEL.